A

Second Defence

OF THE

Propositions,

By which the DOCTRINE of the

Holy Trinity

Is so Explained, according to the

Ancient Fathers,

As to speak it not *Contradictory* to Natural Reason.

In *ANSWER* to A

Socinian Manuscript,

In a LETTER to a Friend.

Together, With a *Third* Defence of those Propositions, in Answer to the Newly published *Reflexions*, contained in a Pamphlet, Entituled, *A Letter to the Reverend Clergy of Both Universities.* By Edward Fowler, D.D.

Both by the Author of those Propositions.

London, Printed for *B. Aylmer* at the *Three Pidgeons* in *Cornhil*, 1695

LIBRARY OF THE

ERRATA.

PAge 16. Line 27. dele *it*. P. 20. l. 23. for *doth* read do. P. 32. l. 22. for *that proceed from the Sun* r. that proceeds, without the Sun. P. 33. l. 9. for *Pooceed* r. Proceed. P. 37. l. 3. for *Stages* r. Stage). l. 5. for *Soul)* r. Souls. P. 46. l. 17. for *Incorporal* r. Incorporeal. P. 49. l. 1. for *does* r. do.

THE PREFACE.

THE *Propoſitions relating to the Doctrin of the* H. Trinity, *were but Twenty-one when the* Manuſcript *mentioned in the* Title-Page, *was writ againſt them: But all the Twenty-eight, which ſince came out, are implyed in them. And I acknowledge that thoſe Written Papers occaſioned my making them ſo many more, to put the* Explication *more out of danger of Miſconſtruction.*

There is likewiſe ſome difference in the Wording *of thoſe Twenty-one and the* Title, *and two or three ſmall Additions, but the* Sence *of both is Exactly the ſame. Thoſe I drew up in Compliance with a Gentleman of as great Worth as Quality, who requeſted me to give him in Writing the Sence, he once heard me Affirm to be the moſt Ancient, of this Grand Article of our Faith; and in my Opinion incomparably Preferrable to the Later Hypotheſes. And falling into this Method, of Expreſſing, Clearing, and Confirming the Fathers Notion of the* Trinity, *by Propoſitions, I delivered, when I had finiſhed them, a fair Copy of them to that Gentleman, and gave my foul one to a Friend, who needed Satisfaction about this Great Point.*

This Perſon, ſome time after, brought me from a Socinian *Acquaintance of his, an Anſwer to my Paper, Concealing his Name from me: and I ſent him my Thoughts of his Performance, as ſoon as my Occaſions would permit me to Conſider it; which are contained in the next following* Defence. *Only in what I now Publiſh, I abridge a little in a few places of what I writ, nor is there any other Conſiderable Alteration.*

And as I Printed not more than an Hundred *Copies of the* Propoſitions, *till I Reply'd to the* Anſwer *to them, a while ſince Publiſh'd by Another Hand; So the now Coming Abroad of* This *Anſwer, is* Solely *Occaſion'd by the* New Reflections.

But if it be thought no fair dealing with my Adverſary, that I do not Publiſh alſo his *Papers, I have this to Say, I have them not to Publiſh, but returned them at* His *deſire, who brought them to me, not thinking it worth the while to take a Copy of them, ſince I had not then a Thought of ever Printing my Reply.*

But if I have played any Tricks *in Tranſcribing what I Animadvert upon (which is the Subſtance of the Whole) both my Adverſary and his Friend are able to let the World be Acquainted with them. But I Abhor ſuch Doings.*

The

The Twenty Eight *Propoſitions.*

1. THE Name of *God* is uſed in more Sences than one in Holy Scripture.

2. The moſt Abſolutely Perfect Being, is God in the higheſt Sence.

3. *Self-Exiſtence* is a Perfection, and ſeems to be the Higheſt of all Perfections.

4. God the Father alone, is in reference to His *Manner of Exiſtence* an Abſolutely Perfect Being; becauſe He alone is *Self-exiſtent.*

5. He alone, conſequently, is abſolutely Perfect, in reference to thoſe Perfections, which do preſuppoſe Self-Exiſtence.

6. Thoſe Perfections are *Abſolute Independence*, and *Being the Firſt Original of all other Beings:* In which the *Son* and the *Holy Ghoſt* are comprehended.

7. All *Trinitarians* do acknowledg, That theſe Two Perſons are from God the Father. This is affirmed in that Creed which is called the *Nicene*, and in that which falſly bears the Name of *Athanaſius:* tho' with this difference, that the *Holy Ghoſt* is aſſerted in them, to be from the *Son* as well as from the *Father.* Wherein the *Greek* Church differs from the *Latin.*

8. It is therefore a flat Contradiction, to ſay that the Second and Third Perſons are Self-Exiſtent.

9. And therefore it is alike Contradictious, to affirm them to be Beings Abſolutely Perfect in reference to their *Manner of Exiſtence*; and to ſay that they have the Perfections of *Abſolute Independence*, and of being the *Firſt Originals of all things.*

10. Since the *Father* alone is a Being of the moſt Abſolute Perfection, He having thoſe Perfections which the other Two Perſons are uncapable of having; He alone is *God* in the Abſolute Higheſt Sence.

11. And therefore our bleſſed Saviour calls *Him*, *The Onely True God*, Joh. 17. 3. *This is Life Eternal, to know Thee the onely True God, and Jeſus Chriſt, whom Thou haſt ſent.* And it is moſt Abſurd to think, That in theſe Words, and the following Prayer, He did addreſs himſelf to the Three Perſons of the Trinity conjunctly, ſince throughout the Prayer He calls this *Onely True God* his Father; and calls Himſelf twice His *Son*, before theſe Words. Not to mention the Abſurdity of making our Lord to pray to Himſelf, or of diſtinguiſhing Himſelf from thoſe Three, of which Himſelf was One. If ſuch a Liberty as this, in interpreting Scripture, be allowable, what Work may be made with Scripture!

12.

12. Our Lord calls the Father, *The Onely True God*, becauſe He only is *Originally*, and of *Himſelf* God, and the Firſt Original of all Beings whatſoever. As he calls him the *Onely Good*, ſaying, *There is none Good but God*, becauſe He alone is *Originally* ſo, and the Spring of all that Good which is in other Beings.

13. The God-head, or God in this Higheſt Sence, can be but *One Numerically*. Of which the beſt Philoſophers were ſatisfied by their Reaſon; and therefore the *Oneneſs* ſo frequently affirmed of Him in *Scripture* is a *Numerical* Oneneſs.

14. There ſeems to be neither Contradiction, nor Abſurdity, in ſuppoſing the Firſt Original of all things, to be productive of other Beings ſo Perfect, as to have all Perfections, but that of *Self-Exiſtence*, and thoſe which are neceſſarily therein implyed.

15. Suppoſing any ſuch Beings to have immediately iſſued forth from that infinite Fullneſs, and Fœcundity of Being, which is in the Deity, each of them muſt have a Right to the Name of *God*, in a Sence *next* to that in which it is appropriated to the *Father*; ſince they have all the Perfections of the *God-head*, but thoſe that muſt of Neceſſity be peculiar to *Him*.

16. It is evident from the *Holy Scripture*, That the *Son* and *Holy Spirit* are *ſuch* Beings, *viz.* That they have all Divine Perfections but the forementioned: Such as *Unlimited Power*, *Wiſdom*, *Goodneſs*, &c.

17. And they are always ſpoken of in Scripture, as *Diſtinct Beings* or *Perſons*, according to the Proper Signification of this Word, both from the *Father* and from *Each Other*. Nor are ſo many Men or Angels more expreſly diſtinguiſhed as different Perſons or Subſtances, by our Saviour or his Apoſtles, than the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt ſtill are.

18. It is a very preſumptuous Conceit, That there can be no way but that of *Creation*, whereby any thing can be immediately and onely from God, which hath a diſtinct Exiſtence of its own. Or, That no Beings can have Exiſtence from Him, by way of *Neceſſary Emanation*: Of which we have a *Clearer Idea* than of Voluntary *Creation*. It is the Word of the Ancients both Fathers and Philoſophers; nor can a better be found to expreſs what is intended by it, *viz.* A more excellent way of exiſting, than that of *Creation*.

19. It is no leſs preſumptuous to Affirm, That it is a Contradiction to ſuppoſe, That a Being can be from *Eternity* from God the Father, if 'tis poſſible it may be from Him, in a more Excellent Way than that of Creation. And we have an Illuſtration of

of both theſe Propoſitions, by ſomething in Nature. For, according to our Vulgar Philoſophy, *Light* doth exiſt by neceſſary Emanation from the *Sun*, and therefore the Sun was not before the Light which proceeds from thence, in Order of *Time*, tho' it be in Order of *Nature* before it. And the Diſtinction between theſe Two Priorities, is much Elder than *Thomas Aquinas*, or *Peter Lombard*, or any *School-man* of them all, or *Chriſtian-man* either.

20. And if any thing can be from another thing by way of Neceſſary Emanation, it is ſo far from a Contradiction to ſuppoſe, that it muſt only be in order of nature before it; that 'tis moſt apparently a Contradiction to ſuppoſe the contrary.

21. Our 18th. and 19th. Propoſitions do ſpeak our Explication of the H. Trinity, to be as contrary to *Arianiſm* as to *Socinianiſm*; ſince the *Arians* aſſert, That there was at leaſt a moment of time, when the Son was not; and that He is a Creature.

22. Altho' we cannot underſtand, how it ſhould be no Contradiction to affirm, That the Three Perſons are But *One Numerical* Being, or Subſtance; yet hath it not the leaſt ſhadow of a Contradiction to ſuppoſe, That there is an unconceivably cloſe and inſeparable *Union* both in Will and Nature between them. And ſuch a Union may be much more eaſily conceived between *them*, than can that Union which is between our *Souls and Bodies*; ſince *theſe* are Subſtances which are of the moſt unlike and even Contrary Natures.

23. Since we cannot conceive the Firſt Original of All things, to be more than *One Numerically*; and that we acknowledg the now mentioned Union between the three Perſons, according to the Scriptures, together with the intire dependence of the two latter upon the Firſt Perſon, The Unity of the Deity is, to all intents and purpoſes, as fully aſſerted by us, as it is neceſſary or reaſonable it ſhould be.

24. And no part of this Explication, do we think Repugnant to any Text of Scripture; but it ſeems much the Eaſieſt way of Reconciling thoſe Texts which according to the other Hypotheſes, are not Reconcilable, but by offering manifeſt violence to them.

25. The *Socinians* muſt needs Confeſs, that the Honour of the Father, for which they expreſs a very Zealous Concern, is as much as they can deſire taken care of by this Explication. Nor can the Honour of the *Son* and *Holy Spirit* be more Conſulted, than by aſcribing to them all Perfections, but what they cannot have, without the moſt apparent Contradiction aſcribed to them.

26. And

26. And we would think it impoſſible, that any Chriſtian ſhould not be eaſily perſwaded, to think as honourably of his Redeemer and Sanctifier as he can, while he Robs not God the Father for their Sake; and offers no Violence to the Sence and Meaning of Divine Revelations, nor to the Reaſon of his Mind.

27. There are many things in the Notion of *One God*, which all Hearty *Theiſts* will acknowledg neceſſary to be conceived of Him, that are as much above the Reach and Comprehenſion of humane Underſtandings, as is any part of this Explication of the *H. Trinity*. Nay, this may be affirmed, even of the Notion of *Self-Exiſtence*; but yet there cannot be an *Atheiſt* ſo ſilly as to queſtion it: Since it is not more Evident, that *One* and *Two* do make *Three*, than that there could never have been *any thing*, if there were not Something which was always, and never began to be.

28. Leſt *Novelty* ſhould be Objected againſt this Explication, and therefore ſuch ſhould be prejudiced againſt it, as have a Veneration for Antiquity, we add, that it well agrees with the Account which ſeveral of the *Nicene* Fathers, even *Athanaſius* himſelf, and others of the Ancients who treat of this Subject, do in divers places of their Works give of the *Trinity*: as is largely ſhewed by two very Learned Divines of our Church. And had it not been for the *School-men*, to whom Chriſtianity is little beholden, as much as ſome Admire them, we have reaſon to believe that the World would not have been troubled ſince the fall of *Arianiſm*, with ſuch Controverſies about this great point, as it hath been and continues to be.

Dr. *Cudworth*, and Dr. *Bull*.

This Explication of the *B. Trinity* perfectly agrees with the *Nicene Creed*, as it ſtands in our Liturgy, without offering the leaſt Violence to any one Word in it. Which makes our Lord Jeſus Chriſt to be from God the Father by way of *Emanation*; affirming Him to be *God of God*, *very God of very God*, and Metaphorically expreſſing it by *Light of Light*; anſwerably to what the Author to the *Hebrews* ſaith of Him, *Ch.* 1. 3. *viz.* That He is Ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης, *The Effulgency of his Glory*, and χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, *The Character of his Subſtance*: And ſo is as much *Of one Subſtance with the Father*, as the *Beams* of the *Sun* are with the *Body* of it.

And ſince there have been of late ſo many Explications or Accounts Publiſhed of this moſt Adorable Myſtery, which have had little better Succeſs than making Sport for the *Socinians*, I thought it very Seaſonable now to Revive *That*, which I affirm with great Aſſurance to be the moſt Ancient one of all; much Elder than the Council of *Nice*; and to have much the feweſt Difficulties in it, and to be incomparably moſt agreeable to *H. Scripture*.

The Defence, &c.

SIR,

I Have peruſed your Friends Anſwer to the Paper I put into your hand, and here hope to give you a ſatisfactory Reply to it.

I ſhall diſpatch his *Preface* in a few Words. He ſaith, that *The Trinitarians have in Vain tryed their Strength againſt their Adverſaries*. And there's no doubt of it, if *their Adverſaries* may be Judges.

As to his ſaying, that *The Vanquiſhed Victors are* (*viz.* among the *Trinitarians*) *for each buys his Victory with the loſs of his own Explanatory Hypotheſis*; I confeſs I have that *ſoft place in my Head*, which in his great Modeſty he ſaith *our Education has given us*, that diſables me to underſtand the *Sence* of that ſaying: And am inclined to think, that the *inverſion* thereof would have been *better* Sence, how *true* ſoever it would have been, *viz. The Victors vanquiſhed are*; ſince it follows, *for each buys his Victory*, &c. And whereas he ſaith, That *in their Unitarian Tracts, they have thrown a ſtone of Contention among the Trinitarians, and this ſtone has committed them among themſelves*: To paſs by the *Conceitedneſs* of this *latter* Phraſe, and the Pædantry of affecting to ſpeak *Engliſh* in *Latin* Phraſes, found they never ſo untowardly, I may I hope without Offence tell him, that neither are the *Socinians* at a perfect Agreement in *their* Notions: As particularly in that Queſtion relating to the *H. Ghoſt*, *viz.* Whether He be a *Perſon* or no; or a meer Divine *Vis*

or *Energy*: The Followers of Mr *Biddle* aſſerting Him to be a *Perſon*, viz. an *Angel*. Nor need I tell him what a Controverſie hath been among them, about the *Adorability of our B. Saviour*; wherein they are not of a mind *yet*, and I doubt never will be. And many *more* diſagreements in their Opinions, may be inſtanced in, if I cared to go on upon *this* Topick. But what tho' the *Trinitarians* differ in ſome Particulars, in their Explication of the *Trinity*, ſo long as they agree in the *main Subſtance*? I mean, what if they differ in Certain Notions relating to this Doctrine, wherein the H. Scriptures are *Silent*, ſo long as they are agreed in what the *Scriptures Expreſly ſay* of it, or of any *One* of the Perſons of which the Trinity conſiſteth? And they *All* agree in giving Divine Perfections to *each* of them; which the Scriptures moſt expreſly do. And in affirming them conſequently to be each of them *God*, which alſo they believe the Scriptures affirm them expreſly to be. And farther they agree in believing them to be *one* God; tho' they are not all agreed in what *ſence* they are *one*; nor in the Notion of the Word *Perſon*, as relating to them; nor in their Opinion about uſing that Word. But if any of them have ſuch a Value for their own Explications, as to be *ſevere* upon ſuch as diſſent from them in any of the *leſs certain* Parts of them, I will not, I cannot, Apologize for *this*.

And now, Sir, I follow your Friend from *his own Preface, to my Papers Title*, which is this: *An Explication of the Doctrine of the Trinity in Certain Propoſitions, which ſpeak it to be Agreeable with Natural Reaſon, and therefore intelligible, tho' not Comprehenſible by our ſhallow Capacities.*

And here he is pleaſed to exclaim ſomewhat Tragically, againſt my diſtinguiſhing between *Intelligible*, and

Com-

Comprehenſible. *I am*, ſaith he, *perfectly Amazed at this his Diſtinction.* I will not ſay, that I am Amazed at his Amazement, but it ſeems *ſomewhat ſtrange* to me, that *Firſt*, He ſhould call this *my* Diſtinction, when I ſhould think he hath heard and read it a *thouſand* times; Since there is no Diſtinction more common. And therefore, *Secondly*, That he ſhould be *Amazed*, nay *perfectly* Amazed at it. And *Thirdly*, That he ſhould be ſo, for *ſuch* a Reaſon as this that follows, *viz.* *That which makes a Doctrine unintelligible, is its diſagreeableneſs to Reaſon; therefore if the Doctrine of the Trinity be not diſagreeable to Reaſon, neither is it unintelligible; and if it be not unintelligible, neither is it incomprehenſible.*

I Anſwer, That I think the *Obſcure Expreſſing* a Doctrine may alſo make it *Unintelligible:* But this his *Reaſon* may be Expreſſed in theſe fewer words, *I am perfectly Amazed at this Mans diſtinction between Intelligible and Comprehenſible, becauſe they ought not to be diſtinguiſhed:* Or, as he adds, *becauſe they are Synonimous, and ſignify one as much as the other.*

But ſure your Friend cannot think, I ſhould have ſuch an Opinion of a Perfect *Stranger*, as to be Satisfied with his *bare Word* for this. He is Perfectly Amazed at my diſtinguiſhing betwixt *Intelligible* and *Comprehenſible:* I ask Why? He Anſwers, becauſe they *Ought* not to be diſtinguiſhed. But I am ſo Impertinent as to ask again, *Why* they ought not? And he ſo Magiſterial, as to let me have no other Anſwer than, *I ſay they ought not.*

But he needs not be told, That tho' theſe *two* words are *ſometimes* uſed in the ſame ſence, yet not *always*; but have *moſt frequently* different Significations. *Comprehenſible* always implyes *Intelligible*; but *Intelligible* is found Innumerable times, not to imply *Comprehenſible.* And therefore *Comprehenſible* is taken either in a

Larger, or a *Stricter* Sence: And in *my Diſtinction*, as he calls it, 'tis taken in the *Stricter*, as for *the moſt Part* it is. Even his *Dictionary* will tell him, that *Comprehendere* ſignifies ſomething, that *Intelligere* doth not. And according to the *moſt Proper* Acceptation of the word, there is as much difference between *theſe two*, as there is, between *Seeing* a thing and looking *through* it; or *Underſtanding* it, and *Compleatly* Underſtanding it, and having an *Adæquate* Preception of it. And *indeed*, if your Friend had Learnt *Socrates* his *firſt Leſſon*, he would acknowledg himſelf ſo *ſhort-ſighted* a Mortal, as, tho' he *Underſtands* many things, not to be able to *Comprehend* the *moſt Obvious* ones. He would acknowledg that in *this* State, things are only to be Underſtood by their *Properties*, and certain *Modes*, and that the *Naked Eſſence* neither of a Spirit nor of a *Body* is known to us. In ſhort, had I diſtinguiſhed between *Intelligible* and *Apprehenſible*, your Friend might have had more Cauſe for Amazement.

Next he ſaith, *That the Incomprehenſibility of God Himſelf implyes no more, than what the* Apoſtle *Expreſſeth, when he ſaith, His ways are paſt finding out; we cannot underſtand them, that ſignifies as much as, we cannot Comprehend them.* Now it is my turn to be *Amazed*; at leaſt this Sentence muſt be greatly *Surprizing* to more Heads, than thoſe that have (like *Trinitarians*) a *ſoft place* in them. For,

Firſt, Who hath ſo *hard*, or ſo large a Head, as to find only the *Ways* of God incomprehenſible to him? As to be able to Comprehend Gods *Nature* and *Glorious Attributes*?

Second, If *Comprehending* muſt needs be no more than *Underſtanding*, there cannot be a Propoſition *leſs true* than *this*, That we cannot Comprehend Gods *Ways*; for Mankind

kind is Capable of *Underſtanding* them, Or GOD Almighty would never have appealed to the *Jews* as He did, about the *Equity* of His Ways. And therefore when the Apoſtle ſaith, *His ways are paſt finding out*, his meaning muſt be, they are not to be *Comprehended* by us, in *our* ſence of the word: We cannot Graſp, or *Fathom* them; they are of too great a *Depth* for us to dive to the Bottom of them.

And *now*, Sir, I believe you are ſufficiently Prepared to *Wonder*, if not to be *Amazed* at this following Saying of your Friend, *viz. It were a very hard thing, that a Law ſhould be paſſed, poſtnate to a Crime, on purpoſe for the taking off one particular Offender; and 'tis as Unreaſonable, that a Diſtinction ſhould be Coyned* (*viz.* this between *Intelligible* and *Comprehenſible*) *purely for the ſervice of a particular Myſtery; and when that is done, can be of no further uſe, unleſs new Myſteries were to be Created.* And I Appeal to *your ſelf*, as much as you may be byaſſed by Affection to your Friend, not only whether *All* he hath ſaid about this Diſtinction, be not unaccountably ſtrange, but likewiſe, whether I have not given a *more* than *ſufficient* Anſwer to the Requeſt he makes me in *theſe* words: *Ignorant*, or *Unthinking People, may be Cheated with an Empty verbal diſtinction, but ſince* A. T. (by which Letters he all along decyphereth me, and I underſtand he means by them the *Anonymous Trinitarian*) *offers his Explanation to ſatisfie men that are Knowing, as well as Religious, Scholars as well as Chriſtians, I muſt beg him to aſſign the difference between theſe two words, Intelligible and Comprehenſible.* And he gueſſeth what Anſwer I will make, in *theſe* words; *I am apt to think that he will tell me, we can well underſtand that this Propoſition is true*, Three are One; *but we cannot underſtand the* Manner *how Three ſhould be One*: And then makes this Reply

Reply upon me, *Now he might as well ſay, we comprehend the Truth of this Propoſition, but we do not underſtand the manner; but then what becomes of his Diſtinction?* But he might have ſaved himſelf the pains of putting words into *my* Mouth, and then Replying upon them: For you have ſeen he is much out in his Gueſs what I would Anſwer; and if he were not, I ſhould be content to be told that I have more than *One ſoft place in my Head.* For what ſhould ayl me to offer at an Explication *of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, agreeable with Natural Reaſon, if I did *Think* what he would have me *Say*, That 'tis impoſſible to underſtand the *Manner how Three ſhould be One?*

And now he ſaith, *He will take his leave of my Title, with theſe two Propoſitions.*

1. *Three are One, is not true in a ſence that is diſagreeable to Reaſon; and the ſence of a Propoſition that is not diſagreeable to Reaſon is Intelligible and Comprehenſible.*

To which he muſt needs, by *this* time, expect *this* Reply, It is Intelligible, but 'tis not therefore Comprehenſible.

2. *He that underſtands the Truth of a Propoſition, underſtands the manner in which it is true; and he which does not underſtand the manner in which a Propoſition is true, does not underſtand the Truth of a Propoſition, but takes it on Authority.* This Propoſition of his is worded very *oddly*, I cannot make better ſence of it, than by thus expreſſing it: *He who aſſents to the Truth of a Propoſition, underſtands the ſence in which it is true; but he that does not underſtand the ſence, does not aſſent to a Propoſition, but aſſents to it upon Authority.* Now the *former* part of this Propoſition is *ſence*, but nothing to the preſent *purpoſe*; but the *latter* is neither to the *purpoſe* nor *ſence*; as I need not inform you. And now, Sir, your

Friend

Friend is at length come to *my Propoſitions*. As

Prop. 1. *God is a Being Abſolutely Perfect.* To *this* he ſaith *All Theiſts agree it.*

Prop. 2. *That Being which wants any one Perfection, cannot be Abſolutely Perfect.* That is, in the *ſtricteſt* ſence of that Phraſe, as I afterwards explained my ſelf. And he ſaith, that *this Propoſition is ſelf-evident*; as who ſees not that ſo it is? But his *Conſequence* is ſo far from being ſo, that it is a *falſe* one, *viz. Therefore our B. Saviour is not God, but in a Metaphorical ſence*, &c. But had he had but a little Patience, he might quickly have ſeen, that notwithſtanding Our Lord is not *Self-Exiſtent*, there is no neceſſity of his being God only in a Metaphorical Sence.

Prop. 3. *Self-Exiſtence is a Perfection, and ſeems to be the Higheſt; it being an Abatement of any other Perfections Greatneſs and Excellency, tho' in* it ſelf *Boundleſs, not to be Originally in Him who hath it, but derivatively.*

To *this* he ſaith, That *Self-Exiſtence does not only ſeem, but* is *the Higheſt Perfection. This* he might perceive I could have told *him*, as well as he *me*; but 'tis no fault to expreſs our ſelves a little Modeſtly, tho' *he* all along ſeems to be of another mind. But whereas he here ſaith, that *Creatures Perfections are improperly ſo Called, with reſpect to the Creatures*; as he afterwards found, I by no means acknowledg, either the *Son*, or, *H. Ghoſt* to be *Creatures*, ſo we have only *his* word for it, *that the Perfections of Creatures are improperly ſo called with reſpect to them.*

Prop. 4. *God th Father alone* (*ſtrictly ſpeaking*) *is a Being Abſolutely Perfect, becauſe he alone is Self Exiſtent; and all other Beings, even the* Son *and* Holy Ghoſt *are from* Him. *This All* Trinitarians *do acknowledg, and is Aſſerted both in the* Nicene *Creed, and that which bears the Name of* Athanaſius. This

This Propoſition too muſt needs *down* with your Friend, but he likes not the Parentheſis, *Strictly Speaking*, and ſaith *he is very ſuſpicious of it, not that he thinks* A. T. *inſerted it to help a Cauſe off the Weakneſs, whereof he was Jealous, but yet to make his Scheme the more Accountable.*

I thank the Gentleman for being ſo Modeſt in *this Wipe*; but he could not wonder, had he read to the end of my Propoſitions before he Entred on his Animadverſions, that I ſhould here inſert the foreſaid Parentheſis. For I do affirm the Son and H. Ghoſt to be Abſolutely Perfectly Beings, in reverence to the Perfections of their *Nature*; that is, that they are all *Boundleſs* and *Infinite*; and that they have *All* perfections they *Can* have, without a Contradiction; and thoſe are all but *Self Exiſtence*, and what neceſſarily follows upon it, *viz. Being the Firſt Original of All things*; and I add too *Abſolute independence.* But more of this anon.

The Four next Propoſitions, he hath no Controverſy with me about.

But now, Sir, Comes a Propoſition that makes your Friend *tearingly* Angry, *viz.*

Prop. 9. *A Being which hath all the Divine Perfections, that are Capable of being Communicated, may be properly ſaid to be Eſſentially God, upon the account of thoſe Perfections; or to be indued with the Divine Nature.*

This he calls a *Groſs Propoſition, becauſe it Contradicts, not only Common Sence and Reaſon, but even all that* A.T. *hath Advanced.* This is, Sir, a Heavy Charge, but we muſt *wait* a while before he makes it out, that This Propoſition is Contradictory to *Common Sence* and *Reaſon*; for he thus goes on: *He had advanced, that God is a Being Abſolutely Perfect: That a Being which wants any one Perfection, can not be Abſolutely Perfect: That Self-*

Self-Exiſtence is the Higheſt Perfection: That Jeſus Chriſt and the H. Ghoſt are not Self-Exiſtent: That they depend on God the Father: That God the Father is the Original (he ſhould have ſaid the *Firſt* Original) *of all things: And that He can be but one Numerically.* He ſhould have ſaid, that God, in this *Higheſt of Sences*, can be but one Numerically. And now he ſaith, that *Point-blank againſt all this*, A. T. *affirms that a Being which is not Abſolutely Perfect, which wants Self Exiſtence, which wants the Higheſt Perfection, which derives it ſelf from God, which depends on God the Original of all things, who is but one* Numerically, may be Properly ſaid to be Eſſentially God, upon *the account of ſome Perfections* (*for two it ſeems are not Communicated*) *or to be indued with the Divine Nature.*

Now, Sir, what a Multiplying of words is here! *Which wants Self-Exiſtence, Which wants the Higheſt Perfection, Which derives it ſelf from God*; as if theſe *Three* were more than *One* thing: Tho I had no ſuch Expreſſion neither as, *derives it ſelf from God.* And he is a little Injurious to me too, in repreſenting me as Saying, that the Son and Holy Ghoſt have only *ſome* Perfections, notwithſtanding the following Parentheſis; whereas he knows he ought to have repreſented me as ſaying, That they have all that are *Capable* of being Communicated; which are all but *Self-Exiſtence*, and what is neceſſarily therein Implyed. And I ſay, that *this* is not Capable of being Communicated, becauſe there is not a more Groſs Contradiction, than to ſay it is.

But how is *this* Propoſition *Point-blank Contrary* to my *foregoing ones?* This Queſtion he Anſwers by *Asking* Queſtions. For he next ſaith, *he muſt make bold to ask me theſe following Queſtions:* And I will *anſwer* them, as well as I can, as he asks them.

Queſt. 1. *Doth the Divine Nature Comprehend all Perfections; or can it want one or two of the Chiefeſt, and be ſtill the ſame Divine Nature?*

I Anſwer, that the Divine Nature doth Comprehend *all* Perfections; but *Self Exiſtence* is a Perfection, relating immediately to the Fathers *Exiſtence*; not to His Nature or Eſſence; it ſpeaking the moſt Excellent Manner of Exiſting peculiar to Himſelf. Even as *Adam's* Coming into Being by Gods *immediate Creation*, ſpeaks not the Humane Nature in him, a *different Nature* from that of his *Poſterity*, tho it ſpakes his *Perſon* to have an Excellency above all that have come into the World by Ordinary *Generation:* And as the Humane Nature of our B. *Saviour* is not of a different kind from other Mens, becauſe he came by it in a Supernatural way, ſo, I ſay, *God the Father's* Exiſtence being without a Cauſe, doth not make him to have another ſort of Nature, from that of the *Son* and *H Ghoſt*; which may be a Neceſſary Nature, and Uncreated, and be Conſtituted of all the Boundleſs Perfections, of which the Nature of the *Father* Conſiſts abſtracted from the Conſideration of the manner of His Exiſtence, notwithſtanding whatſoever your Friend can Object againſt the Poſſibility thereof: And notwithſtanding any thing I have ſaid in my firſt 8. Propoſitions, this may be aſſerted, without danger of being caught at Contradicting my ſelf; as I hope you'l be Convinc't *anon.*

And now for his next Queſtion.

Queſt. 2. *Can the Divine Nature be Communicated to a Being, when leſs than all Perfections are Communicated to it?*

I Anſwer, that if you'l read again what I have ſaid to the *Former* Queſtion, you will find there needs no other Anſwer to *this.* But I muſt blame the *wording* of this

this Queſtion, becauſe it ſeems to ſuppoſe Præ Exiſtent Beings to which the Divine Nature is Communicated. Whereas the poſſibility of the Exiſtence of other Beings from God the Father, which have the Perfections of his own Nature, is that which is to be underſtood by the *Communicableneſs* of thoſe Perfections.

Queſt. 3. *Can a Being that depends on God, be properly ſaid to be Eſſentially that God, on whom it depends?*

I Anſwer, that ſuch a Being can be properly ſaid to be Eſſentially *that* God in *one* ſence, but cannot in *another*. i. e. It can have an Eſſence of the ſame *kind*, tho' not the ſame *Numerical* one.

Queſt. 4. *Can a Being that diſtinguiſheth it ſelf from the Only True God, be properly ſaid to be Eſſentially that God, who is the Onely True God, and but one Numerically?*

I Anſwer, that becauſe he loves needleſly to Multiply Queſtions, I am not obliged *ſo* to Multiply Anſwers. And *this* being the ſelf-ſame with the *other* Queſtion, I have given my Anſwer to it. And now I hope the Gentleman may be ſatisfied of the true reaſon of my Parentheſis in the 4*th*. Propoſition; Namely, becauſe the *Son* and *H. Ghoſt* may be Abſolutely Perfect as to their *Nature*, abſtracted as I ſaid from the Conſideration of the manner of their Exiſtence; wherein yet they may be ſaid infinitely to Excel even *Arch-Angels:* Theſe Exiſting by voluntary Creation, but thoſe by Neceſſary Emanation: Which is the Word of the *Ancients*, and I cannot find a *better*, to Expreſs what is intended by it, *viz.* a more Excellent manner of Exiſtence, than that of *Creation*. Which *Thouſands* of Perſons, no whit inferiour to the greateſt Maſters of Reaſon, the *Socinians* can boſt of (both Ancient and Modern, Divines and Philoſophers) have not thought deſerves to be Scoffed at, as

Non-ſence and a Contradiction to Natural Reaſon, as much as it is *above* the Comprehenſion thereof; and is every whit as intelligible as are many Notions relating to the *DEITY*, in which all true *Theiſts* as well as *Chriſtians* are agreed; and alſo as are not a few relating to our *own Souls*, their Powers and Faculties, and their Union with, and influence upon, our *Bodies*; and as are *innumerable* Notions too relating to *Material* things, which an Experimental Philoſopher cannot doubt the truth of.

In the next place, Sir, your Friend ſaith, *he deſpairs of hearing a wiſe Word anſwered to theſe Queſtions*, viz. the forementioned. But I will not ſay, where was *his* Wiſdom then, when he *askt* them; becauſe you will Reply, they are however wiſe *Queſtions*, if they ſerve to Expoſe the Trinitarian to whom they are put, and to make his Explication of the Doctrine of the Trinity down right Non-ſence. But I Reply, let the *Unbyaſſed* Readers judge of *this*; and Sir I heartily wiſh, that your *Self* may be one of them.

And whereas he ſaith, that *he will do what he can, to prevent troubling* (that is *my* troubling) *the Queſtions, with Confuſed Empty Jargon:* My Anſwer is, That I think I have not at all troubled the *Queſtions*, whether I ſhall trouble *him* or no, by my Anſwering them. But I expect he will tell you, that my Anſwers are *Confuſed Empty Jargon*, and if he will pleaſe to tell *me* ſo, I ſhall give him no Rougher Reply than *this*, Sir, This is a rare demonſtration, that your ſelf is one of thoſe *Anti-Trinitarians*, whom you Extol in the beginning of your Anſwer to my Propoſitions, as *having Modeſtly, as well as Learnedly and Piouſly, and Strongly Impugned, the Commonly received Doctrine of the Trinity.*

But

But how does he Endeavour to prevent my troubling his Queſtions, with *Confuſed Empty Jargon?* He does it *thus: By Eſſence, I ſuppoſe he means Nature.* I Anſwer, I am willing to do ſo too. And, ſaith he, *in that reſpect perhaps* 3. *Men who have the ſame Nature, may be properly ſaid to be Eſſentially one, but not Eſſentially one Perſon.* I Anſwer, this may be more than a *Perhaps*; but he may perceive by my 15*th. Propoſition* (now the 22.) that I am far from thinking the 3. Perſons in the H. Trinity to be in ſo *low* a ſence *one* as 3. Men are. But, proceeds he *The Nature of the Self-Exiſtent God, is above the Nature of all Beings which proceed from Him; and it can not be Communicated.* I Anſwer, that the individual Nature of the *Father*, is not a *Divine* Nature more truly than *that* of the Two other Perſons: But how does he prove that His Nature cannot be Communicated? Why, ſaith he, *we have no other Notion of the word Communicate, but to* Impart *or* Give; *and what one Perſon does Impart or Give, of any Eſſential and Singular thing, that himſelf hath not, but he hath it to whom it is given. It may be ſome will ſay, Thus it is among Finite Creatures, but the Eſſence of God is not of the ſame Condition,* &c. But as God ſaid to *Job, Who is this that darkneth Councell by words without knowledge?* It may be replyed to this Man, *Who is he that multiplyeth words without knowledge?* For it is not *thus*, as he poſitively aſſerts, Even among *Creatures.* For there is not a Creature that Generates another of the ſame kind, but may be properly ſaid to Communicate its own Nature, and yet notwithſtanding it *foregoes* not its own individual Nature, nor any part thereof. What a Boldneſs then is it to Affirm, that the *Infinite Creator* Cannot do the like! *He that Planted the Ear ſhall He not hear? And He that formed the Eye ſhall not he ſee?* He that hath given

given a Generative Power to the Meaneſt of Creatures, or Creatures that have the loweſt degree of Life, ſhall not *He* have the Same Power Himſelf? I mean A Power of doing that which may be called Generating His own Eſſential Likeneſs, in an inconceivably Infinitely more Excellent manner. I wiſh, Sir, your Friend would well lay to heart that Old Maxim, *Temerè Affirmare, vel Negare de Deo Periculoſum eſt.* Which I will Engliſh to you, who I doubt are no great *Latiniſts*, *'Tis a dangerous thing to affirm or deny any thing raſhly of God,*

As to the *little* that remains upon *this* Propoſition, it conſiſts of a *Repetition* of what *I have* Anſwered, and of what he repeats upon the next Propoſition, which I *will* Anſwer. And indeed, Sir, your Friend is Excellently good, next to *Dareing* Aſſertions, at *Repetitions*, and ſaying things, that are nothing, or very little, to the purpoſe. But you will find Every thing, to have more or leſs ſpoken to it, that is but *one remove* from what is nothing but *mere Words.* And *now* to what he Animadverts on the 10*th.* Propoſition.

Prop. 10. *There ſeems to be no Contradiction, nor the leaſt Abſurdity in aſſerting, that God is able to Communicate Every one of His Perfections, Except thoſe of Self-Exiſtence,* and *Being the Firſt Original of all things.* By the way, my meaning in theſe words, appears plainly by other following Propoſitions, to be *this.* That there is no Contradiction or Abſurdity in aſſerting, That ſuch Beings may have their Original from God the Father, as have all Perfections but *thoſe two*; and which indeed (as I have ſaid) do amount to but *one.*

Now what ſaith your Friend to *this*? He tells us in the *firſt* place. *That for the ſame reaſon that theſe two are Incommunicable, all the Other Divine Perfections are likewiſe ſo.* And whereas he aſſigns *two* Reaſons, why God

God cannot Communicate *theſe two*, he ſaith *for the ſame Reaſons, he cannot Communicate any of His other Perfections.* But how Egregiouſly Abſurd is it, to go about to give *Reaſons*, why God cannot Communicate *His Self-Exiſtence*, and *His being the Firſt Original of all things?* Since that He cannot Communicate theſe, is a *Firſt* and *Self-Evident* Principle: And therefore is Uncapable, as all ſuch Principles are, of being *demonſtrated*; as Every Body knows that underſtands, *What* a *Firſt* and *Self-Evident* Principle is; which Every one muſt underſtand, that can underſtand any thing. Whatſoever is Capable of being *proved*, muſt be *leſs* clear, than is the Argument by which it is proved; and whatſoever Propoſition is *ſo*, cannot poſſibly be a *Firſt* or *Self-Evident* Principle; as no man in his *Wits* does need to be informed. And therefore no ſuch one will go about to prove *this* Propoſition, *The ſame thing can be, and not be, in the ſame Moment.* And the *foreſaid* Propoſition is Every whit as ſelf-Evident as *this*: and the *denial* thereof as Manifeſt a Contradiction. There cannot be a greater, or clearer, Contradiction than to ſay, That God can Communicate *Self-Exiſtence*; it being to ſay in other words, That God can be the cauſe of that which hath *no* cauſe. Nor than to ſay, That God can make a *Firſt Original of All things*; ſince this is to ſay, that He can make a thing to be before Himſelf, and to be the Original of Himſelf; For what is not ſo, cannot be the Firſt Original of *All* things. *And* therefore, whereas his *Firſt*, Reaſon, why God cannot Communicate theſe Perfections is, *Becauſe it is a Contradiction ſo to do*; he might as well have ſaid, 'Tis a Contradiction to ſay that God can do a Contradiction. That He *can* Communicate them is *Contradictio in Terminis*; and therefore 'tis abſurd to give it as a Reaſon why He cannot

not do it, that *'tis a Contradiction.* For you may as well ask, why God cannot do a *Contradiction?* And if a Reaſon can be given for *this*, you may ask a Reaſon for that Reaſon; and ſo in *infinitum.* But if it were onely *Contradictio in Adjecto*, I acknowledg, that becauſe ſuch Contradictions are not manifeſt at *firſt hearing*, at leaſt to Every Body, 'tis proper to give Reaſons to ſhew that there are Contradictions implyed in ſuch Propoſitions. But if, any man ſhould ask me a Reaſon, why *Two and two do not make Twenty*, I would bid him *Go look*, inſtead of telling him, that it is a *Contradiction* that they ſhould; ſince I had as good tell him, *he has a Noſe in his Face*, and better too. But that God can make a *Self-Exiſtent* Thing, or a *Firſt Original of All things*, are Every jot as Evident Contradictions, as that *Two and two do make Twenty.*

But, Sir, your Friend ſaith, that, *'Tis Equally Abſurd and Contradictious, to ſuppoſe more than one infinitely powerful, wiſe and Good Being.* If he means by *Equally* Abſurd and Contradictious as *Evidently* ſo, ſure he is the onely Man that will ſay ſo, nor can he *think* ſo, *ſay* he what he will. But how does he *prove* this? *This* is the Argument by which he does it, *viz. infinite Power, infinite Wiſdom and infinite Goodneſs go together, and may all of them, as well as either of them, be in all Beings whatſoever, as well as in more Beings than one.* But what if I ſay That *this* is as much needs to be proved, as *that* which it is brought to prove? His onely Anſwer is like to be, *you muſt take this upon the Authority of my Lord of Canterbury.* For he onely goes about to Confirm it by a paſſage in His Sermon on 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. p. 13. But I not having that Sermon by me, and he making no Marks to diſtinguiſh between, what is his *Graces* and what

what is *his own*, it is Enough to give him *that* for an Anſwer.

His *ſecond* Argument, whereby he Endeavours to prove the forementioned Self-Evident Propoſition, is, *That Self-Exiſtence is indiviſible, and Gods Self-Exiſtence is neceſſary; and therefore if he ſhould Communicate His Self-Exiſtence to Another, He Himſelf ſhould remain not ſelf-Exiſtent, which is a groſs Abſurdity, and a manifeſt Contradiction.* O Wonderful! is it ſo indeed? I marvel who told him ſo; it may be he takes *this* too on the Authority of ſome Great Man, ſince he troubles not himſelf to *make it out*. But there is as great a neceſſity of proving *this* alſo, as of proving *that* of which it is a Proof. And he makes this brave Argument to prove too, That *Infinite power is as incommunicable as ſelf-Exiſtence, and Infinite Wiſdom and Goodneſs, becauſe theſe are alſo indiviſible.* But the Trinitarian is not ſo knockt down by this *Unmerciful Argument* (to uſe a phraſe of his *own*) but that he may ſoon riſe again. Nay, as Goodluck would have it, 'tis ſo weak a Blow, that he has not *felt* it. And 'twill be found weaker than a Puff of Breath, by that time I have askt him this one Queſtion, *viz.* Is not alſo the individual Nature of Every living Creature indiviſible? But, as was before ſaid, Even the loweſt Sort of them can propagate their own Nature, which is the ſame thing with *Communicating* it; and therefore methinks it ſhould not be ſo *great* a Contradiction to ſay, that He who gave Being to thoſe Creatures can do the like. Or if you pleaſe, *thus*: 'Tis therefore no Contradiction to ſay, That God the Father may be the Original of a Being, which hath power to do all things poſſible to be done, and hath unlimited Wiſdom and Goodneſs. As to the *reſt* of this Animadverſion, I will not ſpend one Minute ſo vainly as to take notice of it; for half an Eye muſt ſee

it to be nothing better than (to give it his own word) *mere Jargon.*

Prop. 11. *It ſeems Evident from the H. Scriptures, That the Son and H. Spirit have all Divine Perfections but thoſe two, ſuch as Unlimited Power, Wiſdom and Goodneſs, and Unſpotted Purity.*

As to *Unſpotted Purity* he grants, that *the Scriptures do plainly aſſert it of our Saviour*, but ſaith, that *that is but the Perfection of a Man or Angel, not an infinite Perfection of a God.* I Anſwer, that *this* he onely with his uſual Confidence ſaies, but tells us not how he *comes* by this Confidence. But ſuppoſe he could demonſtrate *this*, yet the Unſpotted Purity of the *H. Ghoſt* one would think to be the Purity of *a God*, ſince we are ſo aſſured from Scripture, that He is the Author of all that Purity and Holineſs, which Is or Ever ſhall be found in Men. And he muſt have a large ſtock of Confidence, who dares ſay. that the Purity which Excells not that of a Man or Angel, is ſufficient to qualify a Perſon to be the Sanctifier, of all that are or ſhall be Sanctified. And if the Purity of the *H. Ghoſt* be the Purity of a *God*, I hope the Son's Purity may be acknowledg'd ſo to be too: Surely thoſe *Socinians* who believe the H. Ghoſt to be a *Perſon*, will not make him to Excell the *Son* in Holineſs.

Next he Cavils at my ſaying, that this 11*th.* Propoſition *Seems* Evident to me, and ſaith that *Seems* and *Evident, are two words very ill put together; becauſe that which doth but* ſeem *Evident is not really ſo; and that which is Evident doth more than ſeem ſo.* I ſee, Sir, I muſt not hope to Pleaſe this Friend of yours, I verily thought he was about to *Praiſe* me for my *it Seems Evident:* For he ſaith upon it, That [*Seems*] *is a word that Speaks the Modeſty of an ingenuous Enquirer after truth*; and on the Contrary, That *Evident fills the mouth of a man of*

Con-

Confidence; as by the way I muſt tell him he knows by Experience. Yet *for all this*, the good Man deſigned to *Expoſe* me for my *it Seems Evident*; and thoſe two Sentences are *Fleering* ones, and were intended for *Scoffs*. But I pray him to *Mock on* after I have told him that, Firſt, He knows I did not ſay, it *but* Seems Evident. And that, Secondly, 'Tis utterly *falſe*, that *that* which *is* Evident doth *more than* ſeem ſo to all Perſons. There are many *Evident* Truths, that to thoſe who Shut their Eyes againſt the Light, may not ſo much as *ſeem* ſo; and there are *thoſe* who being ſenſible of the weakneſs of their underſtandings, may ſay of *Very Evident* Truths, *this* or *that ſeems* or *appears* Evident to *them*. But we ſhall not in haſte, Sir, Catch your Friend at the Extreme of Modeſty. For whatſoever *ſeems* not agreeable with *his* Reaſon (which we have found to be a Clear and Strong Reaſon indeed) muſt be immediately Contrary to *Natural* Reaſon. And he is onely puzled at Comprehending Gods *ways*, not *God Himſelf* and *his Glorious Attributes*. And he can *Comprehend* whatſoever he *Underſtands*. And now follows Another of his Modeſt Sayings, *viz.* That this Propoſition we are now upon, *does not ſo much as ſeem Evident from Scripture*. And he wiſhes *I had Cited ſome of the plaineſt Texts to my Purpoſe*. But he hath had Enough of thoſe Cited by *other* Trinitarians; many of which the *Socinians* ſo play the *Criticks* upon, that ſhould the *ſame* liberty be taken as to all other Texts, which are Capable of having the ſame work made with them, the Scriptures would be made a mere *Noſe of Wax*.

But however, methinks, the Apoſtle's ſo Expreſly applying thoſe words of the *Pſalmiſt* to the *Son of God*, viz. *Thou Lord in the Beginning haſt laid the Foundations of the Earth, and the Heavens are the work of Thine*

Hands, &c. doth at leaſt *ſeem* to Speak Him *infinitely Powerfull*. And theſame thing does *ſeem* at leaſt, to be affirmed in thoſe words, Coloſſ. 1. 16. *&c. By Him were all things Created, that are in Heaven and that are in Earth* &c. *For He is before all things, and by Him all things Conſiſt.* And St *Peters* Saying to Him, *Lord, Thou that knoweſt all things, knoweſt that I love Thee*, doth at leaſt *ſeem* to Speak his believing him to be *infinitely Wiſe*, and a *Searcher of the very Hearts* of men: which is alſo Expreſly affirmed of Him by St *Paul*, Rom. 2. 16. and 1 Cor. 4. 5. And by our Saviour *Himſelf* too, Rev. 2. 23. *I am He which Searcheh the Reins and Hearts.* And the Apoſtles ſaying, that in Chriſt *are hid all the Treaſures of Wiſdom and Knowledg*, doth ſure *ſeem* at leaſt to Speak His *Wiſdom and Knowledg* boundleſs or infinite. And thoſe words Rom. 9. 5. —— *of whom as Concerning the Fleſh Chriſt came, who is God over All Bleſſed for Evermore*, do at leaſt *ſeem* to Speak Him to have the Divine added to the Humane Nature. And thoſe words, Coloſſ. 2. 9. *In Him dwelleth all the Fulneſs of the God-Head bodily:* And Chriſt's giving Himſelf the *Title* that is Proper *to God*, in his Saying, *I am Alpha and Omega, the Firſt and the Laſt*, doth likewiſe *ſeem* at leaſt to aſſert the ſame thing. And ſo doth *God the Father's* ſaying of His *Son, Let All the Angels of God worſhip Him*; Eſpecially ſince it is ſaid, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and Him onely ſhalt thou ſerve.* And the ſame thing *ſeems* at leaſt to be implyed too, in that Saying of Chriſt, *That all men ſhould Honour the Son, as they Honour the Father*; which is, I think, with *Divine Honour*; and muſt at leaſt *ſeem* to this *man himſelf* ſo to be. And what think you of thoſe words which begin St *Johns* Goſpel? *In the Beginning was the Word, and the word was with God, and the word was God, &c.*

Ail

All things were made by Him, &c. Compared with V. 14. *And the Word was made Fleſh*, &c. Do not *theſe* words at leaſt *ſeem* to ſpeak the ſame thing? And *Socinus* his Expoſition of them, would at leaſt *ſeem* to be no true one (tho' there were no ſuch groſs Abſurditys as the *Arch Biſhop*, among others, hath ſhewn it to be guilty of) ſince he himſelf does acknowledg, that he was the Firſt Inventer thereof, and therefore not known till above Fifteen Hundred Years after the Coming of our Saviour.

And thoſe words, *Iſa.* 9. 6, 7. do *ſeem* at leaſt to be a Prophecy of *Chriſt*, viz. *To us a Child is born, to us a Son is given. He ſhall be called Wonderfull, Counſellour, the Mighty God, the Everlaſting Father, the Prince of Peace*, &c. Nor is it ſo much as a *Seeming* Objection, which the *Socinians* urge againſt theſe words being a Prophecy, that the *firſt* do run in the *Preſent* Tenſe, *viz.* To us a Child *is* born, a Son *is* given, ſince in that Unqueſtionable Prophecy of Chriſt, *Iſa.* 53. Several of the Prædictions run in both the *Preſent* and *Præterperfect* Tenſe: As He *is* deſpiſed and rejected of Men. He *hath* born our Griefs. He *was* wounded for our Tranſgreſſions: And the like almoſt in every Verſe throughout the Chapter. Nor is any thing more Common than this Enallage of *Tenſes* in the Hebrew Language. And their rendring the words next following, ſo as to adapt them to K. *Hezekiah* inſtead of our Saviour, is a wonderful inſtance of their offering violence to Texts of Scripture; for thus they read them, *The Wonderful Counſellour, the Mighty God, the Everlaſting Father, ſhall name him* (viz. Hezekiah) *the Peaceable Prince.* And wheras it follows, *Of the Encreaſe of his Government and Peace there ſhall be no End*; they make *this* to be fulfilled in *Hezekiah*, becauſe he reigned no leſs than *Nine* and *Twenty*

ty Years. See this in the *Brief Hiſtory of the Unitarians* ſo much magnified by them, *P.* 20. of the 2d. Edition.

I have, Sir, now given your Friend a Taſte, and a *mere* Taſt of the plaineſt Texts to my purpoſe, in Compliance with his *Wiſh*; and notwithſtanding my *ſeems*, which he makes ſuch *a do* with, I am as *Certain* as I can be of any thing of this nature, that *theſe* Sriptures and Abundance more, do much more than *ſeem* to Confirm the truth of this *Propoſition.*

And as to the *H. Ghoſt*, I need give no other Proof, of His having all the Perfections of the *Divine Nature*, than what hath bin already ſaid of His being the *Sanctifier*; for ſince this ſpeaks Him Infinitely Pure and Holy, and I may add too, *Omnipreſent*, he muſt needs have all the other, according to your Friends Aſſertion, *viz. That they cannot be ſome in one, and ſome in another, but muſt be inſeparate, and go together.*

And he *now* betakes himſelf to Cite Texts *againſt* Chriſts having Unlimited Perfections, but he gives us only *two*; one to prove His *Power*, and the other His *Wiſdom* to be Limited. That for the Limitedneſs of His Power, is that ſaying of our Lord to *Peter*, when he was Apprehended in the Garden, *Mat.* 26. 52. *Put up again thy Sword*, &c. *Thinkeſt thou that I cannot now Pray unto my Father, and He ſhall preſently give me more than Twelve Legions of Angels?* But 1. There is no neceſſity, that it ſhould be implyed in theſe words, that Chriſt had not power to deliver Himſelf without Praying to His Father for the Help of Angels, or any other help, ſince Unſpeakably Greater Works are Recorded of Him, without any mention of His Praying for Ability to do them: And ſince he had *twice* before done this very work, when he was as much as *now* in the hands of His Adverſaries; as

may

may be ſeen *Luke* 4. 30. and *John* 10. 39. 2. Our Lord's whole Power being Originally from the Father, he, we find, took all opportunities of giving *Him* the Glory of whatſoever he did. 3. He *now* thought fit to declare in the Ears of His Enemies, how Dear He was to *God*, as much as they Hated Him. And therefore, whereas *One* Legion of Angels could have delivered Him, as well as *Twelve*; nay, one *Angel*, as well as ſo many *Legions*; yet He ſaith His Father would ſend Him *Twelve Legions*, upon His Praying to Him; *i. e.* ſuppoſing He could ſtand in need of them. 4. Our Lord did Induſtriouſly Conceal the *Higheſt* ſence in which He was the Son of God, from thoſe who were ſo far from being Capable of then receiving that Doctrine, that He knew they would make Him ſo much the greater Blaſphemer upon that account. Nor would it have been ſo Congruous to His State of Humiliation, for Himſelf *then* to have Proclaimed His Divinity; but *after* His Glorious Aſcenſion, and ſending the H. Ghoſt, according to His Promiſe, was the *Seaſon* for the doing hereof by the *Apoſtles*: As particularly St *Chryſoſtom* hath ſhewed, in more than one of his *Homelys*.

Again, Sir, your Friend Attacques Chriſts Infinite *Wiſdom*, from its being ſaid of the Child Jeſus, That *He grew in Wiſdom*. But does he think us to have *ſo* Soft a Place in our Heads, as to believe the Humane Nature of Chriſt capable of all the Wiſdom of the *Divinity* thereto United? No he does not, for foreſeeing what Anſwer was ready for him, he ſaith, *If it be Replyed that His Wiſdom as God was Infinite, the Scripture does not ſo much as ſeem to tell us any thing of Chriſt, with diſtinguiſhing reſpect to a Suppoſed Divine Nature, in oppoſition to an acknowledged Humane.* To paſs over the Odd Phraſe [*with diſtinguiſhing reſpect*] what if the Scripture ſaith nothing

nothing of Chriſts having a Divine Nature in *Oppoſition* to His Humane, does it not therefore ſo much as *ſeem* to tell us any thing of His having a Divine Nature *diſtinct* from His Humane? That Text, *God was manifeſted in the Fleſh*, doth *ſeem* ſo to do, but I will deſpair of underſtanding much of Scripture, if ſeveral of the forecited Texts do not much more than *ſeem* to do it.

But I have ſlipped *one* Paſſage, which 'tis Convenient to take ſome notice of, viz. But it may be ſaid, that *all Power in Heaven and Earth, is Committed to Chriſt*. And he anſwers, *Tes, to fit Him to be the Great Miniſter by whom God will Judge the World.* I will interrupt him but while I tell him, I wonder it ſhould not *ſeem* to him and Every Man, not only ſtrange but impoſſible, that a *mere Man* (tho' in an Extraordinary manner Conceived) ſhould be a ſubject Capable of *Receiving all Power in Heaven and Earth*, and of Judging the World, both Men and Angels. But he *thus* Proceeds, *But when that Great Day ſhall be over, that Power, that Fulneſs of Power, ſhall be given up to the Great God again.* And I Anſwer, To what purpoſe ſhould a Power (or Authority) be longer retained, than while there is any occaſion for the Exerciſe thereof? The Authority relating to Chriſts Mediatory Kingdom muſt Ceaſe, with the Ceaſing of that Kingdom it ſelf. I did not Cite that Text among thoſe I inſtanced in to prove the Infinite Power of the Son of God, and *induſtriouſly* declined it upon Conſidering, That Chriſt ſpeaks in *thoſe* words of a Power *Committed* to Him, and therefore not *Eſſentially* in Him; and that by *Power* here is to be underſtood *Authority*, and a New Authority relating to a New Kingdom. And now what hath he to ſay to my 12*th.* Propoſition?

Prop. 12.

Prop. 12. It is intolerable preſumption to Conclude, that there can be no way beſides that of *Creation*, whereby any thing can be immediately and onely from God, which hath a diſtinct Exiſtence of its own: Or that no Beings can have their Exiſtence from Him, by way of *Neceſſary Emanation*; ſince there is a Reſemblance of ſuch a thing in *Nature*, viz, The iſſuing forth of Rays from the *Sun*. And now ſee a Rare, and as *Charitable* a Remarque upon the *firſt* words, *It is intolerable Preſumption. There is*, ſaith he, *the very Spirit of the Church in it*. Well, what means he by the *very Spirit of the Church?* it follows, *The Spirit of Degrading and Scourging; the Spirit of Jayling a man, and Ruining his Buſineſs; the Spirit of Fining him, and ſtarving his wife and Children: the Spirit of Burning him, and* (*if anger could do it*) *Sending him to the Devil*. And inſtead of ſending *me* to the Devil, he makes a *very Devil* of me (which is the *worſe* Puniſhment of the two) as mighty *Good* as he has thought me ſometimes, when he and I have had the good luck to jump in our Notions. But why muſt I be ſuch a Deviliſh Perſecutor merely for *one word?* cannot *this* [*Intolerable*] bear a more merciful interpretation? I was very unlucky in lighting upon this Epithet, if it cannot; for time has bin, when I *could* have bin a Perſecutor but *would* not (and that is more than the *Socinians* can ſay) nor have I *ſince* Ever Changed my mind. But I am old Enough to be aſſured from my own obſervation, That there is no being ſecure of any party, that they will never perſecute till they have been *Tryed*. And there is no party (the *Papiſts* themſelves not Excepted) but hath decryed Perſecution, while it hath had no *Power*, to Perſecute. But, Sir, I will take leave to tell your Friend, that, as great an Enemy of Perſecution as he profeſſeth himſelf to be, he is *himſelf* a Per-

ſecutor, and a pretty *Fierce* one too. There are more ways of Perſecuting than *One*, and a man may Perſecute with his *Tongue and Pen*; and whoſoever can do ſo with *either of theſe*, I won't be bound for him, that he will not do it with his *Hand* too, when he hath an opportunity. Now *he* Perſecutes with his Pen, who Employs it in heavily Cenſuring his Brother without juſt cauſe, but ſo hath *he* Employed it now againſt *me*. For I meant no more by *intolerable*, than a *moſt high* Preſumption; nor did you, Sir, I dare ſay, underſtand it otherwiſe; I will not deſcant upon his *very Spirit of the Church*, I am ſure it ſhews *his* Spirit ſufficiently. But, Sir, I thank your Friend for the *Charity* he next expreſſeth towards his *Perſecutor*. *Let us try*, ſayes he,, *whether we can reſtore him to himſelf, and the Spirit of Meekneſs.* But if I am *reſtored* to that Spirit, which he cannot ſay I ever *loſt*, it muſt be by one, to whom I can't reply, *Phyſician heal thy Self.* And do you judge, Sir, whether there is more Heat in my *Propoſitions*, or *his Animadverſions*. But how will he allay the Fury I have Expreſſed in *thoſe* words, or rather in that *one* word? He attempts it by Saying, *That the Socinians know of no otherway but that of Creation, whereby any thing can be immediately and onely from God.* But I did not ſay, that 'tis intolerable Preſumption not to *know* any other way, but to Conclude there *can* be no other. And I ſtill ſay, 'tis a wonderful Boldneſs (to wave *intolerable* becauſe 'tis ſo *intolerable to him*) ſo to Conclude, tho' no other way ſhould be known to *us*.

As to the way of *neceſſary Emanation*, he ſaith *it is the Suppoſal of a thing, where of we have no Idea.* Well, ſuppoſe this, is it *impoſſible* for a thing to be, of which *we ſorry* Mortals have no *Idea*? Is God Almighty bound to give us *Ideas* of the *way* and *manner* how any thing *can* be

be Produced by him? Or *how* what we know does Exiſt *is* Produced? Or to give us Ideas of Every *thing* that he can Produce? Or of Every thing that He *hath* Produced? Sure your Friend will not dare to anſwer *yes* to the two *latter* of theſe Queſtions, and much *leſs* (then) to the two *former*. And if he be not *So daring*, with what face could he object againſt the poſſibility of a *Neceſſary Emanation* from God, becauſe we have *no Idea* thereof? But I tell him, we have Every whit as much an Idea of *Neceſſary Emanation*, as of *voluntary Creation*, underſtanding thereby *the making of Something out of Nothing*. Which *Ariſtotle* and his Followers thought an *impoſſibility*, *Ex Nihilo nihil fit*; or *Nothing is made out of Nothing*, being a Maxim of theirs. And therefore they held both the Eternity and Self Exiſtence of the Matter of the World. And the *Platoniſts* thought the Idea of *Neceſſary Emanation*, at *leaſt* as Clear as that of *Creation*; and the Younger Platoniſts for the moſt part held *Humane Souls* to be by Such an Emanation from the Deity, and therefore to be *Eternal*, tho' not *Self-Exiſtent*. But he ſaith, That *ſomething ſhould come from God which wants ſome Perfection that God has, is* A T's (that is *my*) *Prodigious Suppoſition, under the name of Neceſſary Emanation.*

And *I ſay*, it would be a Prodigious Suppoſition *indeed*, that any thing ſhould come from God, that hath the Perfection of His *manner of Exiſtence*; or that any thing can have it's Exiſtence from *God*, and be *Self-Exiſtent.*

And now, *he will diſplay*, he ſaith, *the Abſurdity and impoſſibility of this Neceſſary Emanation, in two or three Queſtions*; and, I thank him, in Conſideration of *my Soft place*, he himſelf anſwers them for me. Q. 1. *Was God Conſcious to the Emanation?* Yes ſaith he, *Elſe His underſtanding*

derſtanding is not infinite. Q. 2. *Was He ſenſible of the Neceſſity?* *Yes* again, for the ſame reaſon. And I anſwer *yes*, *yes* too, though he has Excuſed me. But now, when I have moſt need of his help, he leaves me to anſwer for my Self, to a ſtabbing Conſequence from thoſe Conceſſions, viz. *But then it follows, that he was determined to one thing, and ſenſible that He was ſo.* I will *here* too adventure to give him *two more Yeſſes*. *Then*, proceeds he, *there is ſome Power above Him, or ſuch a determination is the Law of His Nature; the former*, he ſaith, *cannot be, becauſe God is the Supreme Being.* And he would have done like himſelf, had he given us a *reaſon*, why nothing can be *above* the Supreme Being. *Nor*, ſaith he, *can the latter, becauſe neither Reaſon, nor Scripture, deſcribes God by any ſuch Law.* But, being aware that this is too difficult for *my* Brains, he tells me, *he'l make the matter Plain by a Queſtion.* I ſee he's Excellent at *Queſtions*, and his Queſtion is *this*, *By what Evident Principle of Reaſon, or what Text of Scripture, does it appear to be the Law of an Infinite Nature, to beget Infinite Power, Wiſdom, Goodneſs; and that in a Being that muſt want Self-Exiſtence, and being the Maker of all things?* I anſwer, That if he hath any Idea of the thing called *Non-ſenſe*, and any true *mark* to find it by, he cannot *miſs* of it in this Queſtion. But *who* Ever talked of the Fathers Begetting infinite Power, Wiſdom and Goodneſs in any Being; or otherwiſe than of His Begetting an infinitely Powerful, Wiſe and Good Being? And now comes a *Third* Queſtion, *Does the Idea of an infinitely Perfect Being, Evidently imply the Neceſſary Emanation of another Being?* This Queſtion, ſure, he asked for *askings ſake*; For he knows I deſired to have no more granted me, than that it is not *impoſſible*, or there is no *Abſurdity* in it, That Beings may have Exiſtence

ſtence from God by way of Neceſſary Emanation. And now for the 13. Propoſition.

Prop. 13. It is no leſs Preſumption to Affirm, That it is a Contradiction to ſay, that a BEING can be from all ETERNITY from God the Father, ſuppoſing it Poſſible that it may be from Him, in an higher and more Excellent way, than that of *Creation*; ſince the *Sun*, tho' it is the *Cauſe* of Light, is onely in order of *Nature* before it. To *this* he ſaith, *Firſt, That for one Being to be from all Eternity from the Eternal Father, is a Contradiction one degree more Abſurd, than barely two Eternals.* Not to tell him, that *I* have hitherto thought, that *all* Contradictions are *alike* Abſurd; how does he *Prove* this to be in *any* degree an Abſurd Contradiction? He ſaith, that it is ſo, is *the moſt manifeſt thing in the World.* If I demand a Proof now hereof, I ſhould affront him, had I not already Catcht him at proving (after his manner) *the moſt manifeſt thing in the World.* But I need not *demand* a proof hereof, for he preſently ſets about it. And the *Argument* whereby he proves this *moſt manifeſt thing in the World* is *this, We neither have, nor can have, any notion of Proceeding, or Being from Another, but what implyes the Proceeder who derives his Being, to be inferiour* (he ſhould have ſaid *Poſteriour*) *to that other Being, in order of Time.* In truth, 'tis a pleaſant thing to ſee Men *all of a Piece.* This is perfectly like *his* Arguing; that is, Proving *the moſt Manifeſt* thing, by what is *leſs* manifeſt; nay, this is proving it by what is *very falſe.* He ſaith, we have no Notion of ſuch a thing, and I have already told him, that a thing may nevertheleſs *be*, for *our* having no Notion of it. But he alſo ſaith, we *can* have none; here's *Confidence* too like his own, but let him ſpeak for *himſelf*, and not ſay *We*; for *I* both *can* have, and *have* ſome Notion of ſuch a thing,

and

and ſo may any one that pleaſeth; for ſuch a thing is a daily Object of our *Sight*? Of which *anon*, after I have Conſidered 2. *more* of his Wiſe ſayings. *The Abſurdity and impoſſibility*, ſaith he, *of deriving Exiſtence from God, by a more Excellent way than that of Creation, I have already made manifeſt.* But if any Man of ſenſe be found to be herein of his mind, I will never truſt *my* ſenſe more, in the moſt Manifeſt matters. And *then* he ſayes, *I therefore Conclude, that Eternal Generation cannot be proved by it, unleſs it can be made to appear, that a true Notion is a neceſſary Conſequence of a falſe.* But, Sir, Can you think it poſſible, that your Friend ſhould do ſuch mighty Feats as he makes his Brags of, ſince he cannot diſtinguiſh between, *Denying a thing to be Contradictious and Impoſſible*, and *Aſſerting the truth of it.* And if he knows not, that the *Proof* of ſuch a thing as *Eternal Generation*, was now none of *my* buſineſs; and much more, if he needs to be told, that I only affirmed that there is no Contradiction therein to Natural Reaſon, 'tis hard to ſay, whether *he* was more weak in offering to Animadvert on my Propoſitions, or *I* in troubling my ſelf with taking any notice of his Animadverſions.

And now we come to the Inſtance I give in *this Propoſition*, of an Effect every whit as Old as the Cauſe of it; and your Friend being come to it too, asks me *How I know, that the Sun is the cauſe of Light?* And adds, *by the Revelation of School-Divines perhaps, not by the Hiſtory of the Bible; for, if the Account of the Creation in* Geneſis, *be to be taken in a litteral ſence, that will Convince me of a Philoſophical Errour; for there 'tis ſaid, That God made the Light the firſt day, the Sun not till the fourth.* But, Sir, did you ever meet with ſuch Triſling? *Firſt*, He ſaith, perhaps I have learnt that the Sun is the cauſe of Light, *from the Revelation of School-Divines.*

How

How well was this Flurt beſtowed on *me*, ſince he knew what a Veneration I Expreſt for thoſe Divines, in my laſt Propoſition? *Secondly*, He ſaith, I could not have this rare Notion, *from the Hiſtory of the Bible*; *becauſe the Book of* Geneſis *ſaith, that Light was made the firſt day, and the Sun the fourth.* Admirable I profeſs! Sure this Man hath himſelf been dabling with the School-men, he's ſo Subtil. But what if I grant him, that *that* Light which was Created before the Sun, the Sun was not the cauſe of? Does it follow thence, that the Sun is the cauſe of *no* Light? My *Candle* is the cauſe of the Light I now write by, therefore the *Sun* is not the cauſe of *any* Light. But whereas I humbly Conceive (after all) that the Sun *is* the Cauſe of Light, I owe this my Opinion neither to the *Hiſtory of the Bible*, nor to the *Schools*, but to a certain thing called *Eye-ſight*; and for this Satisfaction he owes me thanks. But *Thirdly*, ſaith he, *The Sun is the Cauſe of Light! He may as well ſay, The Sun is the Cauſe of the Sun*; *and the Light of Light*; *or any thing whatſoever is the Cauſe of its own Nature.* But why ſo I beſeech him? Are the Sun and Light the ſelf-ſame thing? Then a *Glow-worm* hath the Sun in the Tayl of it. And then, the Light was *not* made 3. days before the *Sun*, for all the Book of *Geneſis*. But if he pleaſe to give any Credit to his own *Eyes*, he will be tempted to think, that the Body of the *Sun*, and the Light which comes in at his *Windows* are *two* things. But at laſt we find him in a *good humour*; for, *well then*, ſaith he, *be it granted him, that the Sun and the Light which proceeds from it did begin to Co-Exiſt in the ſame moment of time, but then they cannot be the cauſe of one another.* But *I* muſt be *ſtill* a little Croſs, and ſay, *Firſt*, That I will not have it granted me, that they did begin to *Co*-Exiſt in the ſame moment, for I am ſatisfied to have them

begin

begin only to *Exiſt* in the ſame moment. *Secondly*, Neither ſhall he grant it to me, that therefore they are the Cauſe of *One another*; for I was ſo reaſonable as to be Content to have but *one* of them the Cauſe of the *other*. But now *he* is Croſs again, and ſaith, *That thing which is the Cauſe of another, muſt be in reſpect of Time before the other thing, whereof it is the Cauſe.*

In ſober Sadneſs, my Friend, he might have ſpared all his other Wiſe talk, and only have told me *this* and he had done his Buſineſs. For 'tis as much as if he had ſaid, *Let the Sun be the Cauſe of Light, with all my heart, and let them begin to Exiſt together too, yet notwithſtanding I would have you know, that whatſoever thing is the Cauſe of another thing muſt be in order of Time before it: And for once take my word for it.*

And now, to my Comfort, we are Come to the *Concluſion* of this Animadverſion, *viz.* *What* A. T. *means by Order of Nature, I am not ſure that I can gueſs, for I am not much Verſed in School-Jargon; yet gueſſing at his meaning, I tell him, That I can no more Conceive the Sun without the Light which proceeds from it, than the Light that proceeds from the Sun, from whence it does proceed.* *This* Sentence is long Enough too, to be taken to pieces.

1. He ſaith, *he is not ſure that he* can *gueſs*, and yet *does* gueſs. But my School-learning tells me, that if he is ſure he *does* gueſs, he is ſure he *can* gueſs.

2. He ſaith, he is not much Verſed in *School*-Jargon, that is to ſay, he is Verſt in *Jargon*, but not in *School*-Jargon. And, becauſe we will part fairly I am willing he ſhould know, that I believe *both* theſe Propoſitions.

3. He ſaith, *he is not ſure that he can gueſs, what* A. T. *means by Order of Nature.* As if Priority in order of Nature, and in Order of Time were a Diſtinction of *my* Coyning, like *that* of Intelligible, and Incomprehenſible.

I perceive he is as great a Philoſopher, as School-Divine, if he never before met with *that* Diſtinction, which is much more Ancient than the *moſt* Ancient of the *Schoolmen*, or than *Chriſtianity* it ſelf. But if he hath Ever met with that Diſtinction before, he might have Preſumed, that what *I* mean by it, is but what *other* Folk have Ever meant.

4. He ſaith, *I can no more Conceive the Sun without the Light that Pooceeds from it, than this Light without the Sun.* No nor can *I* neither, for I can Perfectly well Conceive them *both*. I can Conceive the *Sun* abſtractly from any other Light, than what is in the *Body* of it; and I can Conceive too Every jot as well of the Light in *my Houſe* at Noon-day, abſtracted from the *Sun:* And ſo can *he* too, if his great Modeſty would but let him think ſo. But we muſt not forget the *laſt* words of this his Concluſion, *viz. Thus I reckon to have done Juſtice to* A. T's. 13*th. Propoſition, not forgetting the Appendent Similitude.*

And *I* reckon I have done no *injuſtice* to his Animadverſions, on *this* or any other of my Propoſitions; and whether *he* be out in *his* Reckoning, or *I* in *mine*, let any man of his *own* Chuſing be judg, that has but *Common-ſenſe.*

Prop. 14. Thoſe two Propoſitions do Speak our Explication of the H. Trinity, to be as Contrary to *Arianiſm* as to *Socinianiſm*; ſince the *Arians* aſſert, that there was at leaſt a Moment of time, when the Son was not, and that He is a *Creature.*

On this he ſayes nothing, that I can be Concerned to reply too, unleſs I delighted in Expoſing him, for Expoſings ſake.

Prop. 15. Tho' we cannot underſtand, how it ſhould be no Contradiction to affirm, that the three Perſons are

but one numerical Being, yet hath it no Appearance of a Contradiction to ſay, That there is an Unconceivably Cloſe and inſeparable Union, both in *Will* and *Nature* between them. And *here* too is very little to draw a Reply from me, Except I delighted in *Repetitions* as much as *he* does; but two or three Paſſages I can't well let go. He ſaith, *It is a very Stange Boldneſs for men to determine, that ſuch or ſuch a Notion is true, which they cannot Conceive is true.* But 1. How comes *Boldneſs* all oth' ſuddain to be ſuch a *Crime* with this Gentleman? 2. How comes that Propoſition by ſuch a Remarque as *this*? ſince it Speaks nothing of the *Truth* of any Notion, but affirms one Notion, to have no Appearance of a *Contradiction* in it. Nor does he offer a *word* to ſhew that there is any Contradiction therein, or any *Appearance* thereof; which a *Wiſe* man would believe to be his *onely* Buſineſs, could ſuch a one undertake Confuting of this Propoſition. 3. Who are they that *determine* any Notion to be true, while they cannot *Conceive* it to be ſo?

And another Saying he hath here, which further demonſtrates what a deadly Enemy he is to *the* Crime *Boldneſs*, viz. *A Cloſe and inſeparable Union between God and Chriſt, there cannot be; unleſs he means ſuch a Union as is between different Natures; but that will not content him, yet 'tis all that can be granted.* But I much doubt, that *this* is much *more* than *he* will grant; I fear he will not grant, That God the Father and his Begotten Son, are as Cloſely United as are *his Soul and Body*, the Natures of which are as different, as the Natures of any two Created things can be; and their Union with Each other ſo *Cloſe* (tho' not inſeparable) that he is as unable to give an account of *this* Union as of *that* which Trinitarians do believe to be between *God the Father, the Son and the H. Ghoſt.* But

But he ſaith, *The Nature of God the Father includes Perfections, which are not in the Nature of Jeſus Chriſt*; and from thence Concludes that ſuch a Union as the forementioned cannot be between them. To which, I am loth to repeat what I have ſo often ſaid, That the Fathers Self-Exiſtence, with what is there in implyed, is a Perfection immediately relating to *His manner of Exiſtence* But however, are there not many Perfections, or Excellent Powers and Properties in *Souls*, which are not in *Bodys*? And yet the Union between them (as was ſaid) is too *Cloſe* for us to give an Account thereof.

Prop. 16. Such an Union as this between them, being acknowleg'd by us, together with the forementioned intire Dependance of the *Son* and H. *Spirit* upon the *Father*; the *Unity* of the Deity is as fully, to all intents and purpoſes, aſſerted by us, as it is neceſſary or deſirable it ſhould be. But to *this*, Sir, as he ſaith very *little*, ſo not a *line* that I can reply a new word to; nor a *Syllable* is here of *Confutation.*

Prop. 17. And no part of this Explication, do we think Repugnant to any Text of Scripture, but it ſeems to be the beſt and *Eaſieſt* way of Reconciling thoſe Texts, which according to the other Hypotheſes, are not Reconcileable, but by offering Extreme Violence to them.

Now to *this* he ſaith, That *he is infinitely certain, that this Explication is in a great part Repugnant to many Texts of Scripture, and to many Self-Evident Principles of Reaſon.* But not *one* of thoſe many Texts of Scripture, does he inſtance in, and we have *ſeen* what work he makes with *Self-Evident Principles.* Nor is *here* any Offer at a *Confutation*, Except his calling me an *Iſhmalite Trinitarian* be ſo, *whoſe hand is againſt all the Heads of the Trinitarian-Expoſitors, and all their hands againſt*

me; and a ſcareing Threat, how *Mercileſs —— would Expoſe me*, and that he would do it *at another kind of rate than he hath done.* But I ſay, ſhould he Expoſe me at the *Same* rate, he would be mercileſs to *himſelf* onely. But ſince he ſaith, that *my hand is againſt all the Heads of Trinitarian Expoſitors*, 'tis Enough to tell him that 'tis *falſe.*

Prop. 18. The *Socinians* muſt Confeſs, that the Honour of the *Father*, is as much as they can deſire taken Care of by this Explication; nor can the Honour of the *Son and H. Ghoſt* be more Conſulted in any Explication of the H. Trinity, than it is in *this?* It aſcribing to them all Perfections, but what they cannot have, without the moſt Manifeſt Contradiction. Now the *firſt* thing he here ſaith, that I ought to take notice of, is, *That he who gives more to an Excellent Perſon, than of Right belongs to him, may perhaps be in a great part Excuſed for the ſake of his good intention, but muſt nevertheleſs always be chid for the injury he offers to him, becauſe by giving too much to him, he brings the juſt meaſures of his real Excellency into Queſtion.* Now inſtead of an *Anſwer*, I would ask *him* one Queſtion more, who has askt *me* ſo many, *viz.* which is the Safer of the *Two Extremes*, To think of the *Son and H. Ghoſt more* or *leſs* honourably than we ought, Provided that God the *Fathers* Honour be not in the leaſt intrenched upon? Sure, 'tis impoſſible for any ſincere Chriſtian *not* to Chuſe to Err on the *Right-Hand*, if he muſt Err on *One.* On *that* Hand we chuſe to Err in our Opinion of *whomſoever* we have a Reſpect and value for. Now if the Honour of the *Father* be as much as can be taken care of in this our Explication; and we believe *it is*, ſince he is made the *Original* of all the Excellencies and Perfections, that are in the other Perſons, and of their *Exiſtence.* And

ſince

ſince there are ſo great a Number of Texts, which have more than ſeemed to the Generality of Chriſtians (and to all but a *ſmall handful* ſince *Arianiſm* went off the Stages to give the Perfections of the *Divine Nature* to *theſe* Perſons, ſurely the *Love and Eſteem* which all good Soul) muſt neceſſarily have for them, muſt needs byaſs them towards the Underſtanding of Scripture in *that* ſence, which makes *moſt* for their Honour, provided it be not Forced and too Artificial; and Provided, I ſay again, the *Father* loſeth no Honour thereby.

Again he ſaith, *That, to his knowledge, the* Socinians *are not willing to Confeſs that the Honour of the Father is as much taken care of in this Explicaiion, as they do wiſh it were.* But he offers not at any reaſon, *why* they are not willing to Confeſs *this*. But ſure they will not ſay, that their *own* Hypotheſis doth give more Honour to the Father, than *that* which ſpeaks him the Author of *all* that the other Perſons either *have* or *are*.

Laſtly, he ſaith, *That the Scripture no where tells us, that Jeſus Chriſt, or the Holy Ghoſt deſired to be accounted God: That Jeſus Chriſt did not command nor deſire Divine Honours to be paid Him is plain, in that when he taught His Diſciples to Pray, He did not propound Himſelf as the Object of Prayer, but directed them to Addreſs themſelves to the Father.* To *this* I Reply,

Firſt, That ſuppoſe neither of theſe Perſons is ſaid in Scripture to *deſire* to be accounted God, are there there fore no Texts which ſpeak of either of them as God? I have I think ſufficiently minded him of the Contrary.

Secondly, How can he ſay that Jeſus Chriſt deſired not Divine Honours to be paid to Him? (Except he means, that he deſired none to be paid him while He was on *Earth*), when He hath told us *John* 5. 23. that *The Father hath Committed all Judgment to the Son; That all Men ſhould Ho-*

nour

nour the Son, even as they Honour the Father. And are not all the *Glorious Angels Commanded by the Father to Worſhip His Son?* Heb. 1. 6. And is not *Eternal Glory* given to Him, *Apocal.* 1, 5, 6. *Now to Him that loved us, and waſhed us from our Sins in His own Blood, and hath made us Kings and Prieſts unto God, and His Father: To Him be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever?* And will not all ſuch Texts ſpeak Him an Object of Divine Worſhip, becauſe that in the Days of His *Humiliation*, He expreſſed no deſire of being ſo; but ſtill gave all the Honour of whatſoever He did to His Father?

Thirdly, I doubt from *this* Paſſage, that your Friend is gone *beyond* his Maſter *Socinus*, and denyeth the *Adorability of the Son of God*, for which *he* was a Zealous Champion. I am heartily Sorry for him, if it be ſo; this being (to ſpeak modeſtly) to make a very large Step towards being no Chriſtian.

Prop. 19. And one would think it impoſſible, that any Chriſtian ſhould not be eaſily perſwaded, to think as Honourably of his Redeemer and Sanctifier, as ever he is able, while he Robs not God the Father for their Sake; and doth not offer any violence either to the ſence and meaning of Divine Revelations, or to the Reaſon of his Mind. To *this* he Replys,

I. That *Saving the Honour of the Father Intire and Uninjured, the* Socinians *think as Honourably of the Son, as any Men whatſoever.* I Anſwer, Surely the *Arians* Opinion of Him is far more Honourable than the *Socinians*, who will not allow Him to be other than a *mere Man*, nor to have had a Being before He was in the Womb of the Virgin; whereas the *Arians* Doctrine is, that He hath a *Super-Angelical* Nature, and that He was *before all Worlds*, and that the Father Created them by *Him*; and yet they Conſult the Honour of the *Father*, as much as the *Socinians* can no; they making *all* that belongs to the *Son* to be from *Him.*

II.

II. He ſaith, that *ſome of the* Socinians *think as Honourably too of the H. Ghoſt; tho' 'tis to be Confeſſed, that others do think the H. Ghoſt to be a Divine Energy or Virtue, and not a Perſon; whether of the* two *is not plainly revealed, and my Antagoniſt does not tempt me to diſpute the Queſtion.* Not to Reflect upon your Friends wiſely calling me *his Antagoniſt*, who had nothing *then* to do with him, don't thoſe *Socinians* that believe the *H. Ghoſt* to be a *Perſon*, make Him no better than an *Angel*, how then do they think as Honourably of Him, as thoſe that believe Him to be *God*, and yet Rob the *Father* of no Honour? And whereas he ſaith, *It is not Plainly revealed whether the H. Ghoſt be a Perſon or no?* I ſay, it is as plainly revealed, as that the *Father himſelf* is a Perſon; nor can any one be more plainly ſpoken of as a Perſon, than the *H. Ghoſt* ſtill is by our *B. Lord.* But ſome Men will diſpute *any* thing; and *ſome* too, who *little underſtand* the Knack of diſputing.

III. He ſaith, *That to think as Honourably as poſſibly we can, of any Perſon, beſides God the Father Almighty, is not our duty.* But I hope I need not tell him, that *Id Solùm Poſſumus, quod Jure Poſſumus. We can only do that, which we can lawfully do.* And he knew I could mean no other by *Poſſibly* can, than *Lawfully can.*

IV. He ſaith, *We are to think but juſt ſo Honourably of Jeſus Chriſt, as God directs us in the New Teſtament.* And I ſay, what ever directions we have what to think of Him in the *Old Teſtament* too, are alſo to govern our thoughts concerning Him. And we are wholly led by the *H. Scripture* to think ſo much more Honourably both of *Chriſt* and the *H. Ghoſt*, than *he* and his *Friends* do.

V. He ſaith, *That we muſt leave it to God, who will be Honoured above all things He hath made, and will not Communicate His Honour to Another, to appoint what Honour*

(hall

ſhall be done to His Son. And *we* ſay ſo too; and therefore wholly take our direction in this Point from Divine Revelation. And that ſaying of God Almighty's, that *He will not give His Glory to another*; or to any one of His *Creatures*, Confirms us in our Belief, that the Son of God is not a *Creature*; ſince *He will have us to Honour Him, Even as we Honour Himſelf.* And whereas the *Socinians* ſay, that God will have Him ſo Honoured, as He is His Ambaſſador, and Repreſentative, I Anſwer, that ſo Angels have often been too, and yet (as I need not tell them) it was ever *Idolatry* to pay Religious Honour to them, upon any account. An *Angel* that was ſent on an Embaſſy to St *John*, ſaid to him, upon his falling down before him, *See thou do it not, for I am thy Fellow-Servant*, &c. *Worſhip God.*

And thus have I replyed to every thing in *this* Animadverſion too, that I have not already ſpoken, more than once, to.

Prop. 20. There are many things in the Notion of *One God*, which all hearty *Theiſts* will own are Neceſſary to be Conceived of Him, that are every whit as much above the reach and Comprehenſion of Humane Underſtandings, as is any part of this Explication of the Trinity. Nay *this* may be affirmed, Even of the Notion of *Self-Exiſtence:* But yet there is not an *Atheiſt* ſo ſilly as to call it in queſtion; ſince it is not more Evident that *One* and *Two* do make *Three*, than that there could never have been *any* thing, if there were not ſomething in Being, which was *always*, and never *began* to be.

To *this* he only replys, *That there are many things directly contrary, to Self-Evident Principles in this Explication; and he truſts he hath plainly proved it.* And, Sir, do you judge, as much as he is your Friend, how he has Proved it.

Prop. 21.

Prop. 21. Leſt *Novelty* ſhould be Objected againſt this Explication, and ſo ſuch as have a veneration for *Antiquity* (as it becomes *all* to have) ſhould be prejudiced againſt it, we can make it Evident, that it very well agreeth with the Account, which the *Nicene* Fathers (even *Athanaſius* himſelf) and others of the Ancients who have treated of this Subject, do in divers Places of their Works, give of the *Trinity*. And had it not bin for the Subtil *School-men* (to whom CHRISTIANITY is little beholden) we have reaſon to believe, that the World, ſince the Fall of *Arianiſm*, would never have been troubled with ſuch Controverſies about this great Point, as it hath bin and Continues to be.

Now to *this* your Friend ſaith,

1. *Novelty is the leaſt Objection I have againſt his Explication, but 'tis a good Exception, which he will never be able to anſwer.*

But *this* Propoſition tells him, I am prepared to ſhew, that this Explication agreeth very well with the Account that the *Ancients* do give of the *Trinity*. And therefore he might have had the Patience to have ſeen whether 'twas a Vain Boaſt or no, before he had ſo Confidently Pronounced me forever unable to anſwer the Objection of *Novelty*.

2. He ſaith, *I can hardly think that his Hypotheſis, take it altogether, will down with any* Trinitarian. But I Phanſy that if he did not Miſtruſt it would down with many, he would not be ſo Angry, as he *is*, with it. And now,

3. He gives me his Parting Blow, and it is a *Stunner*, viz. *And as for Ancient Fathers, how weak a thing is it, to ſeek Credit to An Hypotheſis, upon the account of their Concurring!*

But, but now, *Novelty* he acknowledg'd to be a *good Exception*, tho' the *leaſt Objection*, of which Diſtinction between *Objection* and *Exception*, himſelf muſt have the Honour, and 'tis as *Wiſe* a one, as *mine* between *Intelligible* and *Comprehenſible* is a *Weak* one; but how is *Novelty* any *Exception* againſt an Hypotheſis, if the Concurrence of the Judgments of *Ancient Fathers* can give *no Credit* to it? But whereas I called this Blow a *Stunner*, I was in too good Earneſt,; for theſe his laſt Words do as Perfectly Amaze *me*, as my now mentioned Diſtinction did *him*. And ſince *Stunned* People are not good at Talking, I have no more to ſay, but that I know not, whether there be more of Arrogance than Ignorance, or of Ignorance than Arrogance in *theſe* words.

And now, Sir, if you ſhall think that I have Treated your Friend with too much Freedom, and have given him too Courſe a Farewell, the onely Apology I can make for it, is, That I find him ſuch a ſort of Adverſary, as would not Permit me to Treat him otherwiſe.

However, the Liberty he hath taken with *me*, hath not the leaſt Influence upon my *Spleen*, and I wiſh him as well as you *know* I do *your ſelf*. And particularly, that he may learn to be more Modeſt, and think it Poſſible that thoſe Opinions which he takes for moſt Evident and moſt Neceſſary Truths, may be as Groſs and Dangerous Errors; and that his Underſtanding is not ſo much above the Pitch of other fallible Mortals, but that he may be mightily Miſtaken when he is moſt Confident. And I heartily Pray, that you *both* may with all Sincerity and Impartiality Conſider what is here offered to you, and that God would give us all a right Underſtanding in all Divine Truths. Theſe things, I ſay, are heartily Prayed for, by

Your Affectionate Friend, E. G.

The Latter Defence.

THERE are other *Trinitarians* Concerned with me, in this Gentlemans Book of *Reflexions* mentioned in the *Title-Page*. His *7th. Chapter* Conteins thoſe he hath made upon the 28. *Propoſitions*, which conſiſts of 15. *Sections*, that begin with *Numb.* 56. The *Firſt* is no more than *a Recital* of 3. or 4. of my Propoſitions. The Writer ſaith upon them,

Sect. 57. 1. *That two Infinite Subſtances ſhould Emane from one Infinite Subſtance, is ſo groſs a Notion, that I wonder any Man of Senſe ſhould be guilty of it: And my Reaſon is, becauſe all Infinites, of what ſort or nature ſoever, are equal; for if one Infinite be leſs than another, there muſt be ſome* Terminus *Bound or End of it, and Conſequently it cannot be Infinite, of which there can be no Bound or End; or if one Infinite were any ways more than another, there would be ſomewhat more than Infinite; which is Evidently Abſurd: Therefore to ſuppoſe two Infinites to Emane from one, is to ſuppoſe two to Emane from one, when each is equal to the one from which it Emanes.*

Here, and in the remaining part of this *Section*, is Demonſtration with a *Witneſs* againſt the Ancient Fathers Hypotheſis, of the *Sons and H. Spirits being from the Deity by Emanation*; and againſt *my* Hypotheſis, of the *Poſſibility hereof.* I will take a little more Liberty with this Subtil Gentleman, when I am better acquainted with him (as I ſhall be quickly) than I will at *preſent*. For he may think it no good Breeding to tell him *homely* all my mind, at our very *firſt* Meeting. But now a *Complement* is more

Civil, as I thank him, he begins with too great a one to *me*. And my Complement is, *Sir, I Commend your Wiſdom in Changing all along* my *Phraſes*, viz. *Beings whoſe Perfections are unlimited*, and *who have all they can have without a moſt manifeſt Contradiction*, for a Phraſe I not once uſe in my *Propoſitions*, viz. *Infinite Subſtances*; becauſe I underſtand it nothing ſo well as thoſe Phraſes. And I ſay he did *Wiſely* herein, Since had he uſed *my* Phraſes, this Section would not have looked quite ſo ſcaringly. But let the Reader ſtill put one of my Phraſes in the place of *Infinite Subſtances*, and then Conſider whether Contradictions would ſo Immediately and at firſt Sight ſeem to appear in this *Hypotheſis*.

But I ſhall deliver my mind a little more freely to him, relating to the matter of *this* Section when I come to his 63d.

But I have not ſo done with *this*, but ſhall farther Conſider what it ſayes. And be he pleaſed to take notice, that there is *nothing* in this Acute Arguing, except he means by *Infinite Subſtances*, Subſtances of an Infinite *Quantity*, or Bigneſs. But I hope he will be ſo far from attributing Quantity or Bigneſs to the Subſtance of the *Deity*, that he will not do it to the Subſtance of an *Angel* or *Humane Soul*. 2. It next follows, *To ſuppoſe one Infinite Subſtance to Emane from another, is to ſuppoſe the whole entire Subſtance to Emane from it ſelf*. But this I deny, and do Acknowledg that if I granted it, I muſt without any farther troubling either *him* or any of his Brethren, bid adieu to the *Fathers* Hypotheſis they are ſo diſpleaſed with, as a plainly Contradictious one: Seeing it aſſerts a real Diſtinction of the Divine Subſtances, tho' no Difference in them. It follows 3. *And what makes it ſtranger, is, that the two Infinite Subſtances Emaned from the Fathers ſingle Subſtance, yet there was no diminution*

in

in the Subſtance of the Father; it is as Infinite as it was at firſt. But how ſhould *this* make the Hypotheſis *Stranger*, when it would be the Strangeſt thing in the World, if the Divine Subſtance were Capable of the leaſt Diminution, ſince thoſe that believe *Spiritual* Subſtances, know that none of *them* are: But *anon* a little more of *this*. *But it may be ſaid*, ſaith he, 4. *Why may not one Infinite, as well as one Finite, proceed from another?* And then he thus anſwers himſelf, *But nothing can be more abſurd, than to ſuppoſe one Finite (much more two) to Proceed from one but of the ſame Bigneſs.* Yes, I'le tell him what is *more Abſurd*, viz. To ſuppoſe one or more *Infinite* Subſtances, to Proceed from another *Infinite* Subſtance of the *ſame Bigneſs*. This is more Abſurd, becauſe there is one more Contradiction in *this* Suppoſition than in *that*, *viz.* That Bigneſs belongs to a Spiritual Subſtance; which kind of Subſtance, I hope he will acknowledg to be *alone* Capable of Infinity.

But as notable Work as our Author makes, at demonſtrating the Abſurdity of two infinite Subſtances Emaning from *one*, I fancy I know thoſe who may almoſt as much put *him* to it, to defend the *Non-Abſurdity* of a *Sparks* being kindled by (or *Emaning* from) a Spark (both being of the ſame bigneſs) as a *Trinitarian* ſhall need to be by *his* Arguments (I will not be ſo *rude* as to Call them *Cavils*) againſt the Poſſibility of the Other Emanation.

But to uſe his *own* Phraſe *infinite Subſtance*, 'tis ſo far from being impoſſible, that an infinite Subſtance, ſhould Emane from an infinite Subſtance, or (to uſe the *Scripture*-Phraſe) be *begotten* by it, that if any Being can Emane or be begotten by an infinite Subſtance, it *muſt* be infinite too. For, as *Athanaſius* ſaith, *It is impoſſible that that which is begotten, ſhould be a different* *Orat.* 5.

ferent Eſſence from that which Begat. The Reader may ſee what is farther ſaid of *Emanations*, in *2d Defence* p. 26. I have abundantly too much buſineſs lying *now* upon my hands, to find Leiſure for ſo Cloſe a Conſideration of all that this Gentleman hath reflected on the 28. Propoſitions, as poſſibly I might apply my ſelf to, had I time to Spare. But the Truth is, I find his Arguing to be ſuch, as if well followed upon Other Arguments, it might make thoſe, who are willing to be ſo, down right Scepticks, as to almoſt Every thing.

He needs not to be informed, what doughty Dexterity a Sophiſter might ſhew in making it out, that *Creation is a Perfect Impoſſibility:* That *Eternity in both the Notions thereof, is a Monſtrous Contradiction to the Reaſon of our Minds.* And that *ſo* is alſo the *Notion of an Incorporal Subſtance.* And of *Liberty*, nay even in God Himſelf: And of *the Divine Omnipreſence:* And that *both parts of a Contradiction may poſſibly be true.* And perhaps a *thouſand* other things, for which we have the higheſt *Rational* Evidence, may be Expoſed to Ridicule, by a Man who loves to *Chop Logick.* And likewiſe a *many* other things, the Contrarys to which, we have even *Ocular* and the moſt *Senſible* demonſtrations of, may one make ſuch a ſhew of demonſtrating, as to Baffle moſt men. As that *there is no ſuch thing as Motion:* That a *Body can have no influence upon a Spirit, nor a Spirit upon a Body: and much leſs can they be vitally United:* That 'tis *impoſſible that Will and Thought ſhould Stir a Finger:* That *all Bodies are alike Big*, &c. I ſay moſt, if not *all*, theſe Strange Propoſitions, are Capable of being with as Plauſible a ſhew of reaſon defended by a Subtile Sophiſter, as the *Emanation of the Son and Holy Ghoſt from the* Father hath bin now *Confuted* by this Gentleman. So that I cannot but apply thoſe words of the

the *Apoſtle* to ſuch Diſputers, *They have turned aſide unto vain jangling, underſtanding neither what they ſay, nor whereof they affirm.* But I have ſaid Enough to this Section: Each of the following, I ſhall (I think) diſpatch as Eaſily.

Sect. 58. He ſaith, that *whatſoever Emanes, or any way proceeds, from a Self-Exiſtent Subſtance (except it were Created and then joyned to it) is as Self-Exiſtent as that Subſtance.* But I ſay with as great aſſurance, that whatſoever Subſtance Emanes from another, muſt Owe its Exiſtence to that other; and the Contrary is a manifeſt Contradiction. As to his Reaſon for thus aſſerting, viz. *Becauſe before its Emanation, it was a Part of the Self-Exiſtent Subſtance*, it is taken from Material Subſtances, which do Conſiſt of Parts; but this cannot be ſaid of Spiritual ones, becauſe they are not *diviſible*, and therefore have *no* Parts. And it is Obſervable too, how well this Reaſon Suits to *Eternal* Emanations.

Sect. 59. This Section hath ſeveral very Surprizing things in it. As 1. Our Author *cannot ſee, ſince the Son and Spirit are neceſſary Emanations, how they owe their Origin more to the Father, than the Father Owes His to them.* Which is as much as to ſay, ſince the Tree neceſſarily iſſues forth from the Root, and the Rays from the Sun, therefore the Root owes its Origin no leſs to the Tree, and the Sun to its Rays, than the Tree to the Root, and the Rays to the Sun. 2. His Reaſon for that Aſſertion is, that *the Father Son and Spirit are all three of a Subſtance, that is Self-Exiſtent.* But *I* ſay onely the *two latter* are ſo, for the Firſt (as he needs not to be told) *is* the Self Exiſtent Subſtance; not *of* or *from* ſuch a ſubſtance. But if he asks me *How* they Emane from the Father, I know not which of us would be the more Preſumptuous, *he* for Asking, or I for Endeavouring to

Anſwer

Anſwer that Queſtion. But (on ſecond thoughts) I will undertake to Anſwer it, when he ſhall be pleaſed to Anſwer me *this*, *How did your ſelf come into Being?* Or, What is the *Modus* how *any* thing comes to be what it is, or to be at all? 3. He adds, *Nor could the Father more than They, be the cauſe of the Separation, ſince They neceſſarily Separated from one another.* But can I need to mind him, that our Hypotheſis will not bear a *Separation* between the Divine Perſons, and only aſſerts a Diſtinction betwen them? And ſure I need not tell him, that *he* is not over-fit to Write Books, who knows not that Diſtinction, and Separation, and Difference too, are *Several* things. But 4. Whereas he ſaith that, no one of theſe Perſons can be the cauſe of their Separation, becauſe they *Neceſſarily* Separated, doth he think that God can be the *Neceſſary* Cauſe of nothing? Or that He is in His own nature *Indifferent* to every thing? If he believes (for Inſtance) that the Perfection of His Nature doth not Neceſſarily determine Him, to what is *beſt*; or to do whatſoever He in His Infinite Wiſdom knows *fit* to be done, I hope there are not many of his mind. He ſaith, 5. That *it is another Contradiction to Affirm, that an Infinite Subſtance is divided into Three Infinite Parts.* How does our Author already *run Taplaſh!* But I will not therefore forbear Replying, and I Anſwer, No doubt it is a *Horrid* Contradiction ſo to Affirm. But how *rank* does this ſmell of the Groſs thing called Body! His mind runs altogether upon Material Subſtances, which alone I ſay have *Parts* to be divided into. And if a Spiritual Subſtance cannot be divided into ſpiritual Parts, much leſs can an Infinite Spiritual Subſtance be divided into Infinite Spiritual Parts. And he who thinks that a *Spirit* can be divided into parts, had as good never take that word into his Mouth, and much leſs can he Pretend to believe it a thing of an *Immortal* nature, which whoſoever does

does not, whatever Theologers they may be, I can't admire them for Philoſophers. 6. He makes it in what follows an Abſurdity to deny that whatſoever proceeds from another thing, muſt be in Order of Time after it. Theſe are his words, *Whatſoever Proceeds from a thing muſt firſt be in it, Except it can be in it and Proceed from it, at the ſame time.* But as we never *thought* of ſuch a thing, as the Two Perſons ſo Proceeding, as to be *Separated* from the *Firſt*; nor of any more than their having their *Origin* from Him, ſo *this* they may have and yet ſtill be in Him, and might *ever* have been in Him. Can our Author think (not to trouble him too often with the *Rays* being from the *Sun*, and yet as *Old* as it) that all *Thoughts* muſt be Younger than *Minds*, becauſe they have their Original from them. This can be denied by none, that make Minds to be *Thinking Beings:* I mean, that do acknowledg Thinking to be *Eſſential* to Minds. But *this* I have ſpoken to in the *Preceding Defence.* p. 29, 30, &c.

Sect. 60. He ſaith, *That it had bin Intolerable in the* Pagans, *to believe thoſe Rays that come from the Sun, to be the Sun it ſelf.* And I need ſay no more, than that it is *as* Intolerable to believe the Son and Spirit, who have their Exiſtence from the Father, to be the *Father Himſelf.* But I deſire him to think ſedately with himſelf, whether Gods *Decrees* could *none* of them be Eternal, I Phanſy he is not ſo much a *School-man* as to anſwer, Gods Decrees are God Himſelf.

Sect. 61. He ſaith, *what I further add are direct Contradictions*, reciting ſeveral more things Contained in my Propoſitions; and this is the *whole* of this Section. Here is not one word of Proof, that any *one* of them is a Contradiction; and therefore I have nothing to add *here.*

Sect. 62. He affirms, 1. That *Neceſſary Exiſtence from Eternity is as great a Perfection, as Self-Exiſtence.* But not to tell him, that whatſoever doth *neceſſarily* Exiſt, muſt have bin from Eternity, and therefore ſuch an Exiſtence is never attributed to a Creature; I do abſolutely deny, that neceſſary Exiſtence from *Another*, is as great a Perfection as neceſſary Exiſtence from *Ones ſelf.* Can our Author in his Cool thoughts imagine it is? He ſaith 2. *If the Father hath given Exiſtence to any Being, which he cannot take away, He would Ceaſe to be Almighty.* But I conceive, that to ſuppoſe that the Father can make a Being to Ceaſe, which hath a *Neceſſary* Exiſtence from Him, would be a Contradictious ſuppoſal; and that Contradictions being Objects of *no* Power, cannot be Objects of *Divine* Power; and that therefore the Almightineſs thereof Conſiſteth in an Ability to do whatſoever Implyes not a Contradiction, or that *Power* can do: And ſo doth our *Author* conceive too. He ſaith, 3. That *Self-Exiſtence Separate from thoſe Powers, which can only belong to a Self-Exiſtent Being, is no Perfection.* But I ask him, how Self-Exiſtence *can* be Separated from thoſe Powers? and if it cannot, What does this ſaying Signifie? And it is certain it cannot. But if he means *Abſtracted* by *Separate*, as he uſed a very Improper word to expreſs his thoughts by, I deny that the Notion of Self-Exiſtence *abſtracted* from all other Conſiderations whatſoever, Implyeth no Perfection. And I have as much Liberty to Contradict him without giving my *Reaſon*, as he hath to Affirm this without giving *his*. But *indeed* this denial of mine needs no Reaſon, for that Self-Exiſtence is as *Such* a Perfection is *Self-Evident*, or I know not what is ſo. But were it not that I find him in one of theſe Sections, aſſerting *Creation out of nothing*, this Paſſage would lead me to a very ſhrewd Suſpicion, that he is of *Wolzogenius* his Mind, and ſome

others

others of his Brethren, *That God is not the only Self-Exiſtent Being*, but that the *Rude Chaos* was, and therefore *all Matter* now is, Self-Exiſtent too. And if they could demonſtrate *this* to me, I Confeſs I ſhould do what lyes in me, to think Self-Exiſtence to be no Perfection at all, in ſpight of its being Self-Evident that it is a *great* Perfection, if not the *greateſt*. 4. He ſaith, That *if the Perſons have the ſame Unlimited Perfections, but their Manner of getting them was different, that would not cauſe any Inequality betwen them.* But I ſay it *would*; that is in reference to their Manner of Exiſtence, tho' not in reference to their mere Eſſence.

What *follows*, is but dilating on the ſame thing, and repeating what hath been already Conſidered.

Sect. 63. He asks, 1. *How the Father can be greater than the Son and H. Spirit, and be the only Good, when they have the ſame Unlimited Power and Goodneſs?* I Anſwer, They have an Unlimited Power, but not the *Same* Unlimited Power with the *Father*. *Ad Extrà*, or in relation to the *Creation*, their Power is Unlimited; but no body will ſay, that *ad Intrà*, it is the ſame with the Fathers, Except he can believe, that the Son could Beget the Father, as the Father hath Begot the Son. And as to the Fathers being called by our Saviour the *Only Good*, in that he ſaith *There is none Good but God*, I have ſaid in my Propoſitions (with *Grotius* and others) that *that* Phraſe muſt needs ſignifie the Only *Original* Good, or the Only *Fountain* of Goodneſs; which the Father may be, and yet not the onely *Perfectly* Good. And I think that the Perfection of Self-Exiſtence belonging to the Father alone, and therefore thoſe Perfections too, which do neceſſarily *ſuppoſe* Self-Exiſtence, the Father may moſt truly be ſaid to be greater than the Son and H. Spirit, although all the Perfections of *theſe* Perſons are Unlimi-

ted. 2. He asks, *What greater Abſurdity there can be, than that Beings which have Infinite Unlimited Perfections, ſhould want ſome Perfections?* I Anſwer, that indeed there cannot be a greater Abſurdity than to ſay, that a Being which hath an Infinite *Number* of Unlimited Perfections, can want *ſome*; this would be an Abſurdity with a *Vengeance:* But I doubt I am not *Capable* of underſtanding where lyes the Abſurdity of aſſerting, That a Being which hath not the Perfection of Self-Exiſtence, and *thoſe* that ſuppoſe it, may notwithſtanding have in as high a degree as can be thoſe Perfections which they have. 3. He ſaith, That *a Being cannot be partly Infinite and partly Finite.* And ſo he runs on upon *Infinite, Infinite,* which he all along does; and the reaſon of it is obvious enough, *viz.* becauſe it is a rare Amuſing Confounding Word, for *my* Brains, and the Brains of his Readers; there is not ſuch *another* to be met with for the purpoſe. But *Infinity* is not a thing to be made ſo bold with, or talk't of with ſuch freedom and Confidence, as *he* ſtill does, as if it were a very *familiar* matter. But I ſay again, it is no ſuch Monſtrous buſineſs to Imagine, that a Being which hath not Every Perfection, may have thoſe it is poſſeſſed of, in the Higheſt degree. If I cared to talk things which I underſtand nothing of, *I* could talk too of *Infinity*; and ſay, that there are ſeveral ſorts of *Infinity:* That there is Infinity of *Subſtance:* And Infinity of *Quantity:* And Infinity of *Duration:* And Infinity of *Space*; and God knows how many more Infinities: And could ſhew that there is no Abſurdity in ſaying, that all theſe Infinities do not neceſſarily belong to every one of theſe, and I ſhould get great Reputation among Wiſe men for my pains, ſhould they Catch me *thus* Employing my Tongue or Pen.

But

But now I think better of it, I find I am not *quite* ſo Ignorant, as I thought I was; for I can tell this Gentleman, that a Being *Can* be partly infinite and partly not; ſince I have learned that Angels and Humane Souls are ſo: That is, with reſpect to the Infinity of *Duration* they are infinite *à Parte Poſt*, tho' not *à Parte antè*. And what a rare Notion is this!

Sect. 64. As to the little that is *here* ſaid, *viz.* Upon the Odious Topick of *Tritheiſm*, I referr him to my Reply to the *Conſiderator*, my much more Ingenuous Adverſary, which I preſume he hath read, tho' he takes no notice of it.

Sect. 65. Here is nothing to be ſpoken to without Repetitions; and I want time to make them, and he is not in ſuch want of Senſe as to need them.

Sect. 66. Here he Miſrepreſents me, and argues upon his Miſrepreſentation. See *Prop.* 13th.

Sect. 67. Conſidering what I have ſaid to the *Conſiderator*, and already to *this* Perſon, relating to the matter of this Section, I ſhall onely obſerve upon it, 1. That I wonder how any man that hath a due Awe of the Infinite Majeſty of God upon his Mind, can give himſelf leave to uſe ſuch an Expreſſion, as *Tacking two Perſons to God the Father.* I ſcrupled a while, whether I might foul my Pen with Tranſcribing it. 2. He tells us that *Nothing can be more Abſurd than to ſay, that the* 3. *Perſons are One God by Union, and yet are diſtinct from One Another.* But is there no difference betwixt *Union* and *Identity* or *ſelf ſameneſs*? Is there not a real diſtinction between our Souls and Bodys, tho' United ſo cloſely as that *he* cannot conceive *how* cloſely, nor any Man elſe? If he ſhall ſay, that *Union* is but another word for *Compoſition*, I ſhall ſay he is Extreamly out. *Compoſition* being a blending or mixing of the *parts* of diſtinct things

things. The word is Commonly uſed onely of Heterogeneous things: Spiritual Subſtances therefore having no parts, are incapable of being Compounded. And, in my poor Opinion, tho' a Man Conſiſts of a Soul and Body, he cannot be ſaid to be Compounded of them, becauſe onely *one* of theſe hath parts. Our Author 'tis like will Cry Myſtery! Myſtery! to this Talk; as he deſpiſeth *Trinitarians* for calling the Union of the three Divine Perſons a Myſtery: But if even to the Union of the *two* Created Beings *himſelf* Conſiſts of, he cannot *Seriouſly* Cry *Myſtery*, I know what I know of him. I will not ſay Every *Witty* Man, but I am ſure *Every Wiſe* Man will Cry Myſtery! to *Every* thing, as ill as *ſome* can bear that word. I confeſs no Man ſhall perſwade *me* any more than *him* and his Friends, to ſwallow a *Palpable Contradiction* by calling it a *Myſtery*, till he can perſwade me too that God Almighty indued me with falſe Faculties; and *then*, do what I can, I am like to believe but few things more than *Cogito ergo Sum*. But I am as certain as I can be of any thing but what I *ſee* or *feel*, that it is not more difficult to underſtand this Union, than Abundance of other things Relating to the Deity, and innumerable things which our Author muſt believe in ſpight of Fate, if he will be a Chriſtian, or a Theiſt, or but a *Man*.

Sect. 68. He *here* Banters the real Trinitarians, as *doing very Wiſely in ſuppoſing their three infinite Subſtances, to be as cloſe together as can be, leſt there ſhould not be room enough for them, in but one infinite Space*, &c. And then he Enquires, *if the Subſtance of the Father be Every where, how the Subſtance of the Son can be every where too?* I ſhall be a little cloſer upon this Gentleman for the ſtrange liberty he takes in talking of *Infinite Subſtances*, as ſoon as I have done with his *Sections*, than

I have bin *yet* or will *now* be. In the mean time, I will be ſatisfied to Reply *thus* to this *Section*, viz. Doth not this kind of Talk Suppoſe, that he takes the three Divine Perſons (if he thinks two of them are *any* thing) to be *Corporeal* Subſtances? which is ſo *groſs* a Conceit, and ſpeaks ſuch *beaſtly* Stupidity, that I would charge *no* Man therewith, who doth not Expreſly own it. But, hoping he doubts not of the *Being* of Spiritual ſubſtances, nor of the Divine *Omnipreſence*, I ask him how the Subſtance of God the Father can be in thoſe ſpaces which are filled with *Bodies*? Or how can his Soul and Body, or that part of his Body which his Soul poſſeſſeth (if his Philoſophy will permit him to think it doth not pervade the *whole* of his Body) how can they be, I ſay, in the Self-ſame place or *Ubi*, call it which he pleaſes? Surely, one would think, that ſeveral *Spirits* may be together in the ſame individual ſpace, ſeeing the *Penetrability* of Spirits muſt be acknowledg'd by all that believe there are *ſuch* Subſtances (except they have no manner of Notion of what they believe) as well as that a Spirit and an *Impenetrable* Body may be together in the ſame ſpace. As to his adding [*and after the ſame manner*] to [*at the ſame time*] this can be onely for a *Blind*. But we may talk *Endleſly* upon this Subject, and little underſtand one another or Our ſelves; for this, for *certain*, is one of thoſe things, which our minds were never made for any thing *like* a clear perception of; at leaſt in theſe *groſs* Bodies. And much more then (as he will be ſhewed anon) is the infinity of the *Divine* Subſtance to be reckoned of that number. And he is an intolerably Conceited *Fop*, who will not Confeſs ſo much Ignorance, as to have no other Idea of Gods Infinity, than that He hath all Poſſible Perfections, and that all His Perfections are Unlimited. And we are at a perfect loſs what

to

to ſay or think further about the Divine Eſſence. Nay, we have now no Cognizance of more than the Modes and *Properties* of *Bodily* Subſtance, we have none at all of its *Naked* Eſſence. All we can ſay of Body as Body, is, that 'tis *Extended Penetrable Bulk.*

Sect. 69. He ſaith, 1. That *the Trinitarians ſay, the Perſons are one God, as the Soul and Body are one Man:* And then he Expoſeth the folly of that *Simile.* But he might have ſaved himſelf this little labour; for as *I* never ſaid ſo, ſo neither know *I* of any other *Trinitarian* that hath. The Creed indeed which is called the *Athenaſian*, ſaith, That *as the Soul and Body are one Man, ſo God and Man are one Chriſt*; but what is *this* to his Purpoſe? But what *I* have ſaid, is, That the Union between the three Divine Perſons, is not more Unaccountable, than is the Union between the Soul and Body; and that in one reſpect it is *leſs* Unaccountable than *this* Union, *viz.* becauſe *this* is between Beings of perfectly *Unlike* Natures; whereas *that* is between Perſons of the *ſame* Nature. And why diſtinct intelligent ſubſtances, which is the onely definition I can give of *Perſons*, may not be as cloſely United becauſe they are all *intelligent*, as one intelligent Subſtance and a *Body*, is above the little Philoſophy that I can pretend to be Maſter of, to underſtand. 2. Upon the *Simile*, of *the Cloſe Union of the Sun with its Light and Heat*, as he words it; he ſaith, *There are no ſuch Perceptions as thoſe we call Light and Heat, in any Beings, but thoſe that are Capable of ſeeing and feeling; And that this every Common Syſteme demonſtrates:* And *that this is Obvious to all but Children and Metaphyſicians.* What a Wonderful Piece of Learning is here! 1. *Light and Heat Perceptions!* I have heard of Perceptions and Senſations *of* Light and Heat, but that they are Perceptions and Senſations *themſelves*, I have hither

hitherto bin to learn. 2. But they are not (tho') *Perceptions in any Beings, but ſuch as have faculties Capable of Seeing and Feeling.* And 'twould be ſome what Extraordinary, if any thing could perceive Light and Heat, that can neither *ſee* nor *feel.* Yet I am a little miſtaken, if Heat, and Light too, cannot have ſome Operation on Bodies, which have never a One of the Five Senſes. 3. He ſaith, that *every Common Syſteme demonſtrates, that there are no ſuch Perceptions as Light and Heat, but in things that are Capable of ſeeing and feeling.* A *goodly* Demonſtration! But the *Commonneſs* of it may make it the leſs Obſervable. But it is pretty much it ſhould be demonſtrated in *Every* Common Syſteme, and I ſhould never Light on it in any *one* Syſteme. But 'tis no matter, ſince I am a little too Old to be a *Child* (unleſs *twice* one) and then to be a *Metaphyſician* too; for I am told to my Comfort, 4. That *this Notion is Obvious to all but Children and Metaphyſicians.* Yet 'tis Obvious to this Gentleman, *tho'* a Metaphyſician; as I dare warrant him he is (whether he knows it or no, as 'tis like he does not ſince he ſo deſpiſing them) or he could never be ſo Notable at *infinity*, and other moſt Sublime and Abſtruſe Matters. 5. But in good Earneſt, I am ſo dull as to be utterly unable to imagine, but that *Light* would be *Light* (whatſoever is to be thought of *Colours*) tho' there were no Eyes to Perceive it: And ſuch a Heretick in Philoſophy (whether I am in Divinity or no) as to think, that it is an Aggregation of a certain ſort of Particles, as much as *Air* is. And therefore I am not like in *haſte* to be ſhamed out of the Fathers *Simile*, of Emanations of Light from the Sun. Nor do I think that our *Author* himſelf, will ever be able to demonſtrate any Abſurdity in conceiving, that *Heat* differs onely *gradually* from *Fire*, and *Light* from *both:* And that *Fire* is a fluid Conſtituted of

an Exceſſively ſmall ſort of Particles, and *therefore* very Active, Subtile and Piercing; and that a Collection of theſe Minute bodys in ſuch a quantity, and ſo cloſely as to become an Object of Sight, is that which we Expreſs by the words *Fire* and *Flame*; and a leſs cloſe Collection is what we call *Heat*. And that *Flame* differs from Fire, as it is a more diſperſed Collection of theſe Particles, than Fire; and *Light* from both, as it is a thinner Collection of them than either of the other: I ſay, I do not think that our Author, as Skilled as he is content to be thought to be in *Phyſicks* (tho' not in *Metaphyſicks*) can demonſtrate that *theſe* are Abſurd Notions.

Sect. 70. There is nothing to be taken notice of in *this* very ſmall Section, But our being Charged with *Terminating our Devotions in Each of the three Perſons in our Praying to Each of them.* But I ſay, *this* is a very falſe Charge; for we as heartily acknowledg that all the Honour we pay to the Son, and H. Spirit, ought to be *Ultimately* terminated in God the Father, tho' we believe they are not *Creatures*, as *thoſe Socinians* do who are for giving Divine Honour to the *Son*, believing Him to be a Creature and a mere Man. And I am ſure he cannot think *otherwiſe*, of thoſe whom he calls the Real Trinitarians, becauſe their Hypotheſis neceſſarily obligeth them ſo to believe, what ever the Hypotheſis of the *Other* does. But the *H. Scripture* is ſo Expreſs upon *this* point, that I ſhould think no *Chriſtian* ſhould find it hard to believe it: *No*, tho' there were no Other Text but *this* for it, viz.——*That at the Name of Jeſus, every knee ſhould bow, of things in Heaven, and things on Earth, and things under the Earth: And that Every Tongue ſhould confeſs, that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father.*

Having now *done* with my Adverſarie's *Reflexions* upon the

the 28. *Propoſitions*, I will make bold to Argue a while with *himſelf*; and to give him a *Sample* of *his* Reaſoning.

With as Infallible Aſſurance, Sir, as you Talk of Infinite Subſtances, and Reaſon againſt the Poſſibility of the Sons *and* H. Spirits *being Infinite Subſtances from the* Nature *of ſuch Subſtances; I never yet met with your* Fellow, *if you will pretend to have a diſtinct and Explicite Idea of the thing call'd* Subſtance; *but I know not what* Epithet *to give you, if you can take the Liberty to tell me, that you have any ſuch Idea of* Infinity, *as it relates* immediately *to a Subſtance.*

You have indeed told us, that an Infinite Subſtance is that which hath no Bounds *or* Limits; *but did you think you then gave us* a Definition *of an Infinite Subſtance? No, you are a Wiſer Man than ſo; or than to hope that the* Conſtruing of a Word, *would paſs with any but Children and Fools for* a Definition of a thing. *But ſuppoſe, Sir, that I were ſo Eaſy, as to accept of* Boundleſneſs *and* Unlimitedneſs *for a Definition, or Deſcription of* Infinity, *yet I ſhould (Ten to One) put* this *Queſtion (whether an* Eaſy *one or no) What is the Infinity of a* Subſtance? *You will not ſay, this is an Eaſy Queſtion becauſe Anſwered already,* viz. That the Infinity of a Subſtance, is the Boundleſneſs thereof; *for you know you muſt tell us what a Subſtance* is, *before you can make us the Wiſer, by diſcourſing upon* Infinite *Subſtances, Or the* Infinity *of a Subſtance. If you will now be defining this Thing Called* Subſtance, *by certain of its* Properties, *I cannot forbear Proceeding to ask, What is the* Subject *of theſe Properties?* Or, *What is Subſtance Conſidered* abſtractedly *from all* Accidents? If *you tell me,* it is ſomething that doth *Subſtare Accidentibus,* and needs no Support it ſelf, *I muſt be Satisfied with this Anſwer, ſince I know you will not* Attempt *to give a better. But however I will not be diſcouraged, from Asking* on *a while longer, tho' you ſhould give me the* Proverb *for my Pains: And* this *Queſtion next Occurrs,* viz. *Since*

an Infinite Subſtance is ſomething that hath no Bounds, muſt it not reach to all the dimenſions of Infinite Space, *which you were* up *with in your* 68th. Section? *One might be tempted to think, that after you had ſaid abſolutely, as you did* Sect. 57. There can be no Bound or End of what is Infinite, *you will grant* this; *for if it were Extended through the length and breadth of a* Million of Worlds, *if there be ſo many,* this *would not ſpeak it to have* no Bound *or* End; *ſince all theſe Worlds put together will not fill a* Boundleſs *Space. But then I ask what is* Space? *Or* (*to ſpeak a little* Learnedly) *What is the* Ratio formalis *of Space? And you have a ready Anſwer for me,* viz. *'Tis* Vacuity *or* Emptineſs. *Then demand I, What kind of thing is* Emptineſs? *And you have an Anſwer at hand to* this *too,* viz. *'Tis an* Imaginary *thing. And when I have asked, What is a mere* Imaginary *thing? I am much miſtaken, if a Man of* your *Head-Piece will in the leaſt heſitate at Replying,* A mere Imaginary thing, is a real Nothing. *And* then, *Sir,* This *is your Diſinition of an* Infinite Subſtance, *It is a thing that is of Equal Extent with an* Infinite Nothing. *But* hold! *Cry you,* Who gave you leave thus to ask *me* Queſtions, and then to anſwer them as you liſt for me? I would have told you, that my Phraſe *without Bounds or Limits,* is not to be taken *ſo Strictly,* as to ſurpaſs the Space which holds All Worlds. *But, Sir, will* this *Anſwer* do? *Is, after all your Arguing from the Infinity of the Divine Subſtance, your Notion of it onely* this, *that it is as much without Bounds as Gods* Creature *the* Univerſe? *And can this Conſiſt with your having Aſſerted, that 'tis a* Contradiction *to ſay, that there can be more than* One *Infinite Being? But I foreſee you will go near to Reply,* My Notion thereof is far from being *ſo ſcanty* a one as you Imagine; for I hold, that the Infinity of the Divine Subſtance, Conſiſts in its Power to Extend its Preſence thro' all the parts of New Worlds, as they are Created; which God Almighty can if he pleaſes

ſes Create to All Eternity. *But then ſay I, will you pretend, Sir, to have any the leaſt Idea,* How *the Divine Subſtance can do* this? *And is not this Dilatation and farther Expanſion thereof, think you, Capable of being made as Ridiculous and Contradictory a thing, by ſuch a Wit as* yours, *as you think you have made* Emanations *from thence to be? I know you cannot but be Aware, that it is certainly ſo.*

And therefore let the Reader judg, what *Prodigious Monſtruous* Preſumption it is, Excuſe me if I am *now* a little warm, to draw moſt Confident Concluſions from Premiſes, which are Unſpeakably above the reach of *Humane* Underſtandings; as the Gentleman I have now bin *Socratically* talking with, muſt Confeſs the Premiſes are, from which *he* hath Argued againſt *me*. Nay, they muſt be above the Comprehenſion of all *Finite*, as well as *Humane* Underſtandings; Or Nothing is ſo. For *my* part, I dare not truſt *my* Shallowneſs with *two* Thoughts upon ſuch a Subject as this of *Infinite Subſtances*, nor of an infinite *Subſtance* neither. I have a *diſtinct* Notion of a *Being Abſolutely Perfect*, and *Beings of Unlimited Perfections*, tho' infinitely Short of a *Comprehenſive* One, and therefore I choſe to uſe onely *ſuch* Expreſſions in my *Propoſitions*. And becauſe *theſe* are in ſome meaſure adapted to Humane Capacities, the Deity is Every where deſcribed in *H. Scripture*, by its Glorious Perfections of *Wiſdom*, *Power*, *Goodneſs*, *Mercy*, *Righteouſneſs* and *Purity*; and by its moſt Wonderful Exertions and Diſplayings of them in the Creation: And by *theſe* are the *Son* and *H. Spirit* deſcribed *there* as well as *God the Father*. Wherefore I could not without mighty Regret *Critizare Cum Crotenſi* (taking the Phraſe, for *paying our Author in his own Coyn*) as I now did, had I not ſo good a deſign therein, as to Expoſe the Folly and Madneſs of the Liberty which *he* and *others* take, with the moſt Profoundly Adorable Deity.

Can

Can ſuch Perſons read thoſe Queſtions of *Zophar*, without Aſtoniſhment, which he put to *Job*, Ch. 11. 7, &c. *Canſt thou by Searching find out God? Canſt thou find out The Almighty to Perfection? It is as High as Heaven, what Canſt thou do? Deeper than Hell, what Canſt thou know? The Meaſure thereof is longer than the Earth, and Broader than the Sea.*

And now I have done with this *Author*, as well as with his *Reflexions*; who muſt not take it unkindly, that I have been ſo *plain* with him; there being not the leaſt of *Ill-Will* in it, but the greateſt *Good-Will* I am ſure. And notwithſtanding we differ ſo mightily in our Sentiments, I wiſh him as well as I do *my ſelf*.

If any do expect that I will be ſtill Replying *on*, as I am farther Attackt, they'l find themſelves diſappointed, Unleſs ſuch Objections ſhall happen to be offered, againſt the Hypotheſis of the Fathers, the Non-Abſurdity of which I Endeavour to defend, as have not *yet* appeared. And if ſuch *hereafter* appear, as upon Impartial Conſideration I ſhall think *Convictive*, I will not (by God's Grace) be aſhamed to Confeſs that I have bin in an Errour. But rather ſhall think, I cannot do my ſelf a greater Honour, as I cannot do a greater Right to Truth, than by publiſhing a Recantation.

But I will not be ſo *Idle*, as to Contend for the *Laſt Word* with ſuch Men as I know will never yield it me; I mean thoſe who will not diſtinguiſh between *dicibile & dicendum*, what it is *poſſible* to ſay and what *ought* to be ſaid; but will adventure to ſay *any* thing, and turn Every Stone, and put their Wits to their utmoſt Stretch, to invent Replys and Rejoynders, rather than let their Pens *reſt*; and much more, rather than they'l *own* the leaſt Miſtake.

And

And where-ever I find a deal of Art and Subtilty, and mightily Laboured Oppoſitions, Defences or Provings, I cannot but Suſpect, that the deſire of Victory, and the Encreaſing or Upholding of a Party, or Mens great Opinion of their own Underſtandings, have very much the Aſcendent of the Love of Truth.

But how may the Learned *Socrates* ſhame the Self-conceited *Dogmatizers?* Who would not acknowledg that the *Oracle* could have any other Reaſon to Pronounce himſelf *The Wiſeſt of all Men*, but *Becauſe he knew how ignorant he was; and did not think he knew, what indeed he did not.* ὅτι ἁ μὴ οἶδα οὐδὲ οἴομαι εἰδῆναι.

And how may thoſe words of S *Paul*, lay the Plumes of theſe *Gnoſticks*, viz. *If any man thinketh he knoweth any thing*, (or Prideth himſelf in an Opinion of his being a Knowing Perſon) *he knoweth nothing yet, as he ought to know.*

And it is certain, that the more Sincerely and Impartially Inquiſitive any Man is after Truth, the leſs Stiff, Opiniative and Pertinacious he will be; and the leſs Confident of thoſe Notions which are very *diſputable:* Becauſe ſuch a man is no leſs acquainted, with the Strongeſt Objections againſt them, than with the beſt Arguments for them.

And the more Extenſive Knowledge any one hath acquired, the more vigorouſly ſenſible will he be, that he knows but very little. Nor is any Man in a *Capacity* of Perceiving ſuch Shallowneſs and Emptineſs in his Mind, as *he* who is furniſhed with the Largeſt Stock of the moſt Uſeful Knowledge.

The more we know of the *Deity*, and the Stupendious works of Creation and Providence, with the greater Amazement ſhall we Cry out with Holy *Job*, *How little a Portion is heard of Him!* How little am I Capable of underſtanding, either of *Him* or *them!* And the more a

Man

Man hath enquired into the Works of *Nature*, the more Conſcious will he be to himſelf, how Extreamly little he hath bin able to diſcover, even of the moſt *deſpiſed* things; and ſuch as the *Vulgar* take for granted, to have nothing belonging to them, that will afford any Matter for Enquiry.

There is no ſuch Antidote therefore againſt Pride, as the moſt Subſtantial and Comprehenſive Knowledg, whereas nothing makes a Man ſo Conceited and Self-aſſuming, as a ſmall *Smattering* of Learning.

And there are no ſuch Maſters of Reaſon (in their own Opinion) as *ſuch* Men. The moſt Ancient *Fathers*, when they han't the good Luck to be of *theſe* Mens mind, are *Old Dunces*; and as nothing is the truer for *their* ſaying it, ſo neither is it one jot the more *like* to be true. Nor is *Novelty* any Objection to *them*, againſt the Probability of any darling Opinion.

How much rather would I be Modeſt *Socrates*, than a *Chriſtian* who *ſo leans to his own* (or his Parties) *Underſtanding*. In what I have now bin ſaying, I cannot forbear thinking, of *more* Denominations than *One* of Profeſſors of Chriſtianity. But yet I have bin far from Reflecting upon *all* of any Denomination. I am not *Such* a Cenſurer.

God give us All *more Humility.*

THE END.